**RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS**

The response to each comment made by the reviewers has been provided in red.

**REVIEWER A:**

Following the second review, I would like to submit the following recommendations:

1. Page 1, lines 25-27. Please rephrase the sentence.

Ans. The sentences have been rephrased as recommended (see page 1, line 25-27)

2. Page 7, lines 6-7. Please elaborate, otherwise speculative.

Ans. The elaboration has been provided (see page 7, lines 9 & 10 and page 8, lines 1 & 2)

3. Page 8, lines 5-6. Rephrase. Delete show or reveal. In the second half of the sentence, please explain further. Only small amount of what are replaced by surfactant?

Ans. The word ‘show’ has been deleted. The second half of the sentence has been changed to show that authors meant ‘dye displacement’ by surfactant (see page 8, line 7)

4. Page 8, line 16. Delete comma.

Ans. Comma between ‘these, values’ has been deleted (see line 17 on page 8)

5. Page 8, lines 17-19. Please elaborate on how surfactant adsorption enhances the number of negative charges?

Ans. Elaboration has been provided (see page 8, lines 18-20)

**REVIEWER B:** Before publishing few technical errors should be corrected:

1. Page 2, line 19: Instead “structures” it should be “molecular structures”.

Ans. The word ‘structures’ has been changed to ‘molecular structures’ on page 2, line 19

2. Page 2, line 22: Instead “Chemical structures” should be “molecular structures”

Ans. The phrase ‘chemical structures’ has been changed to ‘molecular structures’ on page 2, line 22.

3. Page 3, line 10: Instead “Lamda” it should be “Lambda”

Ans. The word ‘Lamda’ has been corrected to ‘Lambda’ on page 3, line 10.