**Dear Editor Acta Chimica Slovenica**

Based on your letter, I revised our manuscript entitled **“Modified screen printed electrode for selective determination of folic acid”**. Enclosed you may kindly find the revised manuscript and response to reviewer’s comments. All changes were shown with red color in the Highlighted Revision.

Editor Comments:

Abbreviations NFO and SPE used in the abstract should be explained.

Dear Editor

We explained them in the abstract.

Please unify the style for the Figures (axes titles, units (/, [])), correct the typos in Figs. 1 (Cm-1).

Dear Editor

We corrected it.

Delete all abbreviations that are not needed (e.g. GPES, which appears only once).

Dear Editor

We corrected it.

Replace all “ml” with “mL” and “µl” with “µL”.

Dear Editor

We replaced them.

Replace the current Fig. 3 title with “SEM micrographs (A) with its EDX spectra (B) of NiFe2O4 nanoparticles”, and improve the quality of this figure, especially B part-axes.

Dear Editor

We added the better SEM image of nanoparticles in Fig. 3.

Fig. 4 is too big compared to Fig. 5. Styles in the insets of Figs. 5 and 7 should be unified.

Dear Editor

We corrected them.

Replace “R.S.D.” with “RSD”.

Dear Editor

We replaced it.

Delete the third column in Table 1, appropriately change the title of the Table 1 and correct the number formats in the last row.

Write the concentration units and number of the replicates into the Table 2.

Dear Editor

We corrected them.

There is still necessary to improve the language. I advise you to use one of the available web manuscripts editing service or to ask an English speaking scientist to help you in this matter.

Dear Editor

The article edited and we corrected all of comments.

Reviewer E:

Comments for the authors:

1) Title; page 1, as such // Critical note ... The compound of interest is being determined, whereas a sample is analysed. So, please, correct the title to respect this difference.

Dear Reviewer

We corrected the title.

2) Abstract; page 1, as such // Critical note ... In my opinion, the Abstract is rather brief and misses some information that would normally be expected. At first, a brief description of chemical background behind the electrode oxidation of FA could have been included. Furthermore, the authors could mention if there was some interference from related compounds or from other constituents usually occurring in typical samples. Finally, the term "real samples" does not say so much and the analysed materials should be specified a bit.

Dear Reviewer

We added some information.

3) Introduction; page 2, lines 32-57 // Recommendation … The text dealing with FA is too long and going into details that are not so necessary for this paper. Thus, this section should be rediced, I would say, to a half. Otherwise, the remaining parts of the Introduction chapter are good and well written.

Dear Reviewer

We corrected it.

4) Experimental; page 3, lines 90-92 // Formal remark … According to the description, the electrode of choice prior to its modification was a commercial product and, in fact, having represented a three-electrode cell. Maybe even this could be implemented in the title or, at least, in Abstract.

Dear Reviewer

We added it in the abstract.

5) Experimental; page 5, Scheme 1 // Recommendation … I am not sure if this scheme is suitable as a figure for scientific paper. More properly, it could be presented as graphical abstract if this option is the case of ACSi journal.

Dear Reviewer

We changed the scheme 1 as presented a graphical abstract.

6) Results and Discussion; pages 8-10, Figs. 3, 4, and 5 // Critical comment … The double image given in Fig. 3 is not fine, indeed. It is too evident that it has been shrunk across the horizontal axis and its rearrangement into normal proportions is highly desirable; in this case, after separating both images and placing them beneath. Regarding other Figs 4 and 5, they would require a similar treatment. (Regardless the fact that all three Figs are rather blurred and their overall improvement would also be welcome.)

Dear Reviewer

We added the better SEM image of nanoparticles in Fig. 3 and corrected Fig. 4 and 5.

7) Results and Discussion; pages 12-15, section 3.5 and onwards // Critical comment … As already stated above --- see point (2) ---, this subject would have deserved an interference study; at least, a basic one. From the text presented herein, it seems that interferences have not been studied at all. Since this undoubtedly a lack of this otherwise fine report, the authors should think about completing their paper with such a study additionally; in other words, with the results of newly performed measurements.

Dear Reviewer

We added the interference studied in section 3.6.

8) References; items [1-62] … The authors should reconsider if more than sixty references for such a paper is not too much. I would say even a half could be more than sufficient.

Dear Reviewer

We reduced the number of references.

Reviewer G:

Comments for the authors:

The authors are suggested to correct Table 1 (decimal points and subscriptions) and Conclusions that are to general written.

Dear Reviewer

We corrected it.

**Authors would like to thank the editor and the reviewer for the very insightful and constructive comments and suggestions. We have carefully taken their comments into consideration in preparing our revision.**

Best Regards

Mohadeseh Safaei