

Author's response

- Line 8: probably the word “that” is missing...: “paper that was”,

Done

- Line 9: delete “(removal of... mirabilis)” from abstract.

Done

- Line 15: remove “(SEM)” and “(TEM)” from abstract (abbreviations not used anymore in abstract)

Done

- Line 17: varies = varied

Done

- Line 18: (ASS) = ASS

Done

- Line 22: must be “0.1 mg/L. Turbidity”.

Done

- Line 25: pathogens are not “breeding” in the water, so do not use that word. At the end of the line: “The”

Done

- Line 31: acid = acids

Done

- Line 32: as mentioned by reviewer “rapidly developing science” should be illustrated by more recent references.

Done

- Use abbreviations, after introduction after first appearance, in the entire document (e.g. now in line 31 AGNPs should be introduced)

Done

- Line 46-54: indicate what is new (in the approach) and contributes to science.

Done

- Line 52: “is” should be “can be”, not clear how you can use readily AgNP impregnated paper in water treatment...

Done

- Line 52: rephrase “a study investigates..”

Done

- Rephrase line 58...

Done

- Line 59: Their = Its

Done

- Line 60: bottle = bottles

Done

- Line 69: which were not..

Done

- Line 69: absorbed = adsorbed

Done

- Line 81: the amount of dissolved silver was analysed

Done

- Line 96: was repeated

Done

- Line 113-114, give references of these studies (see comment of reviewer)

Done

- Line 118: use abbreviation here (ASS already introduced in paper)

Done

- Line 124, give references of these studies (see comment of reviewer)

Done

- Line 130-135: the lines between the dots in the Figures 3 and 4 do not have a meaning

Done

- Line 147: use abbreviation for “silver nanoparticles”

Done

- Line 147-148: give references of these studies (see comment of reviewer)

Done

- Line 157: use abbreviation for “silver nanoparticles”

Done

- Line 157-161: give references of these studies (see comment of reviewer)

Done

- Line 172-177: indicate in the conclusion what is a new finding that contributes to science

Done