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ABSTRACT
The manuscript has been greatly improved in comparison with the previous version, but some revisions are still needed.

AIMS I cannot find aims in the background section, but only a brief version of aims in methods. Move aims in the first paragraph of the abstract adding the assessment of exposure and of determinants

SG-adjusted naphthol: specify what SG means

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Pag 14. Fustinoni et al. assessed naphthalene exposure only in a subset of study subjects: subjects investigated for naphthalene exposure were only 18 and not 108 (see table 2 in Fustinoni et al. 2010 paper).

Looking at results in supplemental table (simple linear regression models), I see that exposure is lower in winter compared to summer. It is obvious that time spent outdoor in winter is shorter than in summer, so this result suggests that staying outside may increase exposure to naphthalene. This is in contrast with the comment that authors make to justify the higher naphthalene exposure in post-partum samples.
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