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Reviewer’s report:

The article has improved a lot. There is still two major questions: SNHL vs NIHL. the control group cannot have NIHL. Also the tinnitus definition is missing. (See below for details)

Major Compulsory revision

Original comment ET24 and ET32. Here is a major problem. The control group is not having noise exposure so they cannot have NIHL, but they have SNHL. The sound professionals have NIHL and also worsening of hearing by other causes. Thus the sentence: it was considered as NIHL ... is completely is not possible for the control group. The same applies for original comment ET32.

I suggest that rephrase to something like this: The subject was regarded to have a hearing loss if ..... This is the official definition for NIHL in national legislation.

Original comment ET26. Sorry being obscure. You have not described how you queried tinnitus. This is essential because there are several definitions in the litterature. The used definition is vital for the evaluation of the tinnitus prevalence.

Nudelman (2001): Replace with

Guide to Occupational Exposure Values, 2007, ACGIH
Then calculte the values using the 3 dB rule

Minor essential revisions

Do not use the word patient. Use subject

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.