Thank you for addressing my previous comments carefully. I understand the authors tested for gaseous-phase PFAS adsorption using a Teflon–Quartz double filter system, following Turpin et al. (1994). The authors reported that PFAS were below MDL level in the second (quartz) filter and thus suggest that adsorption artefacts from gaseous PFAS are negligible. While I appreciate these efforts, I have some follow-up questions and suggestions that I believe should be addressed before final acceptance:

1. Where was the double filter system experiment conducted? Was it carried out at the same location and under similar environmental conditions as the main PM sampling campaign? The modified manuscript text does not provide this important contextual information.
2. The added text (Lines 184–189) could be misinterpreted. It gives the impression that the double filter system was employed throughout the study, rather than being used in a one-time supplementary experiment.
3. From the response, it appears that only a single experiment with the double filter setup was performed. Could the detection of PFAS in the quartz filter below MDL levels simply be due to low atmospheric PFAS levels on that specific day?
4. Since the double filter system was not employed during the main sampling campaign, the potential for gaseous PFAS adsorption onto quartz fiber filters remains a valid concern. While your additional test is useful, it does not fully rule out the occurrence of positive sampling artefacts throughout the study period.