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Reviewer's report:

The authors have carefully revised the paper and worked on all comments. The paper was improved substantially. The paper is more readable now while a lot of details were deleted or removed to the appendix. I have still one misunderstanding: I do not understand the chapter "Change of mercury levels" (lines 565ff). The change of mercury levels is already shown in Table 2, isn't it? There was a change from 26.5 microgram/l (screening or baseline) to 14.2 microgram/l (Day 45). What are the numbers in Table 5? It is incomprehensible to me. And why is Table 5 - if it has a right to exist - not presented directly after Table 2? Beyond this, the style of Table 5 is different to the style of Table 2. E.g., the range (min-max) is given in brackets in Table 2. In Table 5, min and max are separate columns. Why? In Table 2, results per microgram/l are first presented while Table 5 presents microgram/g creatinine first. Why? …

Lines 569-571: I do not understand the sentence. Missing word.
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