**REVISION COVER LETTER WITH DETAILED RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS**

**Title:** *Spatial distribution of PAHs in riverbed sediments of the Danube River in Serbia: Anthropogenic and natural sources*

***Journal of the Serbian Chemical Society***

Dear Editor-in-chief,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript entitled “**Spatial distribution of PAHs in riverbed sediments of the Danube River in Serbia: Anthropogenic and natural sources**” that we would like to be considered for publication in Journal of the Serbian Chemical Society. Please find also a letter explaining, point-by-point, the changes made in response to the critiques/suggestions that we received.

We sincerely thank the Reviewers for their thorough review of our manuscript and for the excellent suggestions that we received. We have made a concerted effort to adequately respond to each suggestion received from the Reviewers. We firmly believe that the Reviewer’s comments and suggestions have significantly improved this manuscript. We do hope that You and the Reviewers find this manuscript acceptable for publication in Journal of the Serbian Chemical Society.

.

**Answers to reviewers**

# Reviewer #1:

**C1:**Page 1, line 14 and 21: No unqualified abbreviations or acronyms in abstract (abbreviations and acronyms must be qualified for a second time, if also used in the main body of the manuscript).

**A1:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and corresponding correction is done.

**C2:** Page 2, line 35: “629 ton/day” instead “628,594 kg/day”

**A2:** It has been done.

**C3:** Page 2, line 53: Which levels of pollutants? Concentration, or?

**A3:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of this sentence.

**C4:** Page 3, line 77: Be consistent with the labelling of the Tables (e.g. Table S1 or Table S.1. or Table A.1.)

**A4:** We accepted the reviewer's comment and at the same way we marked the figures and tables in the manuscript and supplementary materials.

**C5:** Page 4, line 83: Add Fig. S1 reference in the manuscript, there is no indication that Fig. S1 exists. E.g. “…chemical analysis are presented in Section S2 and Fig. S1. (Supplementary material).”

**A5:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of this paragraph.

**C6:** Page 5, line 125: Missing reference.

**A6:** We are sincerely grateful for the reviewer’s comment, but we think that this is a technical error created during converting the word document to pdf format. There is no reference at this place of manuscript in the original version of the word document because this fact (“increase of 60 μg/kg”) was obtained in this study (520-460 μg/kg).

**C7:** General comment: the Conclusion is too long, please reduce it.

**A7:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of this paragraph.

**C8:** General comment: Maybe to move some of the Figures into the manuscript from the SI. This could be very important.

**A8:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and move Fig.2 (Concentration levels of PAHs in the Danube riverbed sediment samples) into the manuscript.

# Reviewer #2:

**C1:** Line: 98, Numbers 99 in Superscript should be replaced with number 9

**A1:** We are sincerely grateful for the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of this reference.

**C2:** Line: 125, Text: “Error! Reference source not found.” in Superscript should be deleted

**A2:** We are sincerely grateful for the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of this sentence.

**C3:** Line :196, It is stated: “the total PAH index was calculated using Equation 1.”  
Is this Equation developed in this research?   
If the answer is YES, that should be stated.  
If the answer is NO, it should be given the appropriate reference to the original research where this Equation was developed.

**A3:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and the corresponding references were added.

**C4:** Line: 391, Word “with” should be replaced with word “which”

**A4:** It has been done.

**C5:** Instead of the RUNNING TITLE: Danube sediment contaminations, as proposed by the authors, a RUNNING TITLE: Danube sediment contamination with PAHs would be more appropriate

**A5:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of running title.

**C6:** According to the Instructions for authors, in the list of references the International Library Journal abbreviations are required. However, in this Manuscript the authors used the full names of the journals. The full names of the journals should be replaced with the International Library Journal abbreviations.

**A6:** We accepted the reviewer’s comment and made corrections of references.

**Dear Editor-in-chief,**

We sincerely thank you for the review of our manuscript and for the excellent suggestions that we have received. We did our best to improve the quality and significance of the manuscript. All the changes made based on the suggestions of the reviewers are marked in red. We deeply hope that the revised manuscript will meet the requirements of Journal of the Serbian Chemical Society will be considered for publication in your eminent Journal.

Kind regards

Maja Turk Sekulic

Corresponding author