**Reviewer 1**

This manuscript intends to provide a retrospective exposure assessment of respirable silica exposures in a population of Chinese construction workers and examine the health outcomes of these workers. The authors intend to assess if current Occupational Exposure Limits are protective to prevent  respirable crystalline silica-related illness and injury.

The manuscript requires extensive editing  for English and readibility. The manuscript should be revised to follow the journal submission format as described in the information to authors (Sustainability | Instructions for Authors (mdpi.com)):

* **Research manuscripts**should comprise:
  + Front matter: Title, Author list, Affiliations, Abstract, Keywords.
  + Research manuscript sections: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusions (optional).
  + Back matter: Supplementary Materials, Acknowledgments, Author Contributions, Conflicts of Interest, References.

Many of the references are not related to silica exposures or construction but, are related to worker and community exposures from  e-waste recycling.  The authors appear to confuse or equate silica toxicity with lead toxicity and in one case (line 51 and 52 of page 2 of the manuscript) state that "Silica poisoning, also known as plumbism, is the harmful impact of a progressive build-up of Silica in bodily tissues caused by frequent exposure to silica-containing chemicals." *Plumbism*is lead poisoning.  Likewise, elevated zinc protoporphyin (or porphyria) is typically used to assess lead toxicity.

When the authors are referring to silica, Occupational Exposure Limits cited are often wrong (confusing ACGIH nuisance dust with RCS) or outdated: Silica, Crystalline - General Industry and Maritime | Occupational Safety and Health Administration (osha.gov)

**Reviewer 2**

Please find my comments below:

Page 127: 3. Methodology Analysis of Occupational Exposure of Silica 127

The authors should improve all of point 3.

Page 128: 3.1. Occupational Exposure to Silica

Enter a text before the table 1.

Page 276: 5. Risk Analysis

According to ISO 31000:2018 Risk management - Guidelines. Risk assessment is the overall process of risk identification, risk analysis and risk evaluation.

Authors should substitute the title for the risk assessment.

 The conclusion must be deepened. It is very poor and should be further developed.

Authors should follow Instructions for Authors Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health.

**Reviewer 3**

1. I suggest correcting substances with subscripts, e.g., line 77/79 SiO2. I recommend revising the whole text and updating the wording of substances and units, e.g., mg/m3

2. Correct order and reference (22), line 89. See ranking of citations.

3. Specify in tables 1 and 2 the specific references for each piece of information contained in the secondary data.

4. Explain the reason for using the EPA standard. I suggest using the WHO standard for human exposure and especially making the comparison - also - with local occupational standards.

5. Review the numbering of the tables, line 198. References?

6. Idem for figures. See line 227—correct wording.

7. It needed to be clarified that the group of workers studied was only those in the construction area. Explain. Justify the limitation in the abstract.

8. The authors mixed environmental standards for air emissions with secondary occupational standards and data. Please verify and correct.

9. The text is a review text. However, the abstract implies that there were workers in the object of the study.

10. Review the methodology because the way it was presented seems inconsistent, mixing secondary data and data related to the natural and artificial environment.