Dear Bojan Radak,

We thank you for your message concerning our manuscript (#7310). We also thank to referee for her/him valuable comments. We revised our manuscript carefully by taking the referee’s all suggestions into consideration. We also offer following explanations about the revision.

Sincerely Yours

Dr. Oya Aydın Urucu

**THE LIST OF CORECTIONS AND MODIFICATIONS**

**Reviewer comment 1**

*Introduction*

I would suggest that the authors attempt to present the key objectives of their study with regards to what is currently known (i.e. literature), thus highlighting the added value of the paper. For instance, what is the benefit of using 5-Br-PADAP as a chelating reagent instead of other possible agents (Ref. 20-22), or what are the advantages of GFAAS compared to other analytical techniques (e.g. UV-VIS spectrophotometry) in terms of selectivity and sensitivity of determination.

**Author’s response 1**

Many complexing agents can be used for determining metal ions in various media. Some of complexing agents for Cd (II) ions and their some of currently known disadvantages were given in introduction part according to literature. Also benefit of using 5-Br-PADAP for determining of Cd (II) ions was given.

Advantages of GFAAS technique compared to other techniques were also given in relevant part of manuscript.

**Reviewer comment 2**

*Line 191*

Interferences may occur due to the competition of other metal ions for the chelating agent and their subsequent co-extraction with Cd. To evaluate the selectivity of the proposed method, the authors have studied the effect of typical potential interfering ions on the analytical signal. However, in Table II only the molar ratio (ion/Cd) is shown, while recovery values are missing.

**Author’s response 2**

We would like to thank you for this issue. Recovery datas have been calculated and added into table II.

**Reviewer comment 3**

*Line 215*

The accuracy of method was checked with spiked/recovery tests and analysis of a standard reference material.

I assume, each water sample was pre-concentrated according to the proposed method, and then the accuracy of the method was verified by the analysis of the initial sample and sample spiked with the different levels of cadmium. What was the initial concentration of Cd in tap water and river water samples? Also, was the proposed pre-concentration procedure applied to the certified reference material SPSWW2?

Regarding the analysis of other sample types (purchased from the local market), the authors stated: „Biscuit and hair dye sample contents were detected by a developed procedure and other methods for comparison“. What other methods? I guess Cd concentrations obtained by „other methods“ were taken as certified values, so at least some details about these methods should be given.

**Author’s response 3**

In our study, tap water and river water were spiked different levels of cadmium and were pre-concentrated according to the proposed method. Initial cadmium amount in tap water and river water was not detected and these were shown such as “n.d.” in table III. The proposed pre-concentration procedure was applied to the certified reference material SPSWW2 and mentioned in that part of manuscript.

As you realize, in our study cadmium concentrations of biscuit and hair dye were detected by developed procedure and compared to certified values of them. Relevant part has been corrected like that. We are grateful to you for informing us, because the previous description could have been misunderstood.

**Reviewer comment 4**

*Line 232*

Instead of instrumental, a method LOD should be given. It can be easily calculated from the slope of the calibration curve and the standard deviation of the background.

**Author’s response 4**

The limit of detection (LOD) of developed method was calculated as 3*S*b/*m* (*S*b: standard deviation of the blank (n=8), *m*: the slope of the calibration graph.) and given in relevant part of manuscript.

**Reviewer comment 5**

*Line 237, Table V*

In Table 4, comparison of LODs between the proposed SFODME – GFAAS method and some of the other published methods used for extraction and determination of cadmium is shown. The detection limit of the measurement method used in this study must be given instead of the LOD of the measurement system. When the detection limit of the measurement method is determined the sample is processed through the all steps of the measurement procedure, and for the evaluation of the performance of the method this is what is relevant.

**Author’s response 5**

As you explained, the detection limit of the measurement method was determined the sample is processed through the all steps of the measurement procedure and the data was corrected in table 4.