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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have strengthened the manuscript. Thank you for including the questionnaire as an appendix. I also appreciate replacing the map with the face mask photos. Tables and Figures are now clearer.

Some essential corrections and clarifications are needed before publication. These include the following:

* The abstract's methods section sentence "A total of 172 workers were interviewed with 31 closed ended and 19 open ended for workers and 12 closed ended and 13 open ended for administrative personnel" is somewhat confusing and needs to be clarified. Two separate sentences would convey the message more clearly and accurately, for example: "A total of 159 workers and 13 management personnel participated in this study. Both closed-ended and open-ended questions were included in the interviews." Move the numbers of question types (open-ended vs closed-ended) away from Abstract as you have explained these in the Methods section of the main text (p. 7).

* The last sentence in Abstract's Methods, I suggest modifying it as "Content analysis was applied to analyze collected data from open-ended questions."

* Important. The sentence that authors added on p. 3 on the IARC evaluations need to be corrected. Also, more up-to-date and appropriate citation(s) is necessary. IARC now classifies both wood dust and formaldehyde as Group 1 human carcinogens. The cited 1995 IARC source is too old. Please provide more a recent IARC citation(s) and reference(s) for both wood dust and formaldehyde.

* Methods, p. 6, line 12, I believe you removed Figure 1 (i.e. the map). If yes, remove Figure 1 citation here.

* Methods, p. 6, 3rd paragraph, line 51. Please replace the first word "They" with "Study participants" as it clarifies the sentence.

* The paragraph added in the Discussion section on p. 19 (lines 28-45) is not clear and does not quite convey the important message the study could offer. I suggest modifying it something like:
"Findings of this study can inform the employers to give equal attention both for permanent and temporary workers' safety and health protection. Employers may undertake such strategies as eliminating or minimizing chemical exposures in the physical work environment through engineering controls or redesigning production processes. Furthermore, providing safety and health training (both pre-employment and periodic) and instituting other necessary administrative controls (e.g. job rotation, facilities for meals and rest breaks) could help in reducing chemical exposures. Although the last resort in the hierarchy of controls, provision of adequate PPE is necessary to protect workers. The study findings might also help policy makers to expand the KAP knowledge and promote the safety and health of workers in the wood industry. For future research, an exposure assessment intervention study could be considered."

* Also, I suggest modifying the text in Conclusions so that it reads better. In particular, the word "poor" is still judgmental. Here's a suggested modified text that might work better:

"This study shows that most workers know about chemical hazards, associated health effects, and preventive measure to reduce chemical exposures. Permanent workers reported more safety-conscious responses to attitude-related questions. Use of PPE was higher among permanent workers; however, temporary workers were not always provided with PPE. Both permanent and temporary workers should be equally privileged in all the safety and health services delivered by the workplace. A systematic qualitative study is needed for future work -- this could be combined with an exposure assessment intervention study."

* Language needs to be checked before publication. Some terms have not been used consistently (e.g. work place vs workplace, particleboard vs particle board, PPE vs personal protective equipment). Also, check the use of hyphens in words (e.g. cross-sectional vs cross sectional; open-ended vs open ended, etc). Last, check the names of authors in the reference list (e.g # 13 & 15, Mäkinen is likely the correct spelling -- not Makinen).
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