Dear Reviewer,

The authors graciously acknowledge the reviewer's comments on our manuscript. We provide responses to each comment received below. Our response is given in red.

Comments I have reviewed the manuscript entitled "Evaluation of Thin Film Composite Forward Osmosis Membranes: Effect of Polyamide Preparation Conditions". I recommend minor revision; though, the following comments need to be addressed.

1- The language is generally good; though, I recommend another round of revision.

We have gone through the manuscript thoroughly again to English-improve the text by re-writing some parts and correcting grammatical errors and typos. We believe that the text in general has improved in this new version.

2- Abs., Please identify the performance results at the optimum conditions.

The abstract has been modified to address reviewer's suggestion.

3- CSA-TEA (2:1), is this a weight or mole percentage?

This is weight ratio; this has been clarified in the manuscript.

4- Figure 1, if you used this figure from another work, please cite.

A reference was added to Figure 1.

5- Line 116, "while the thin polyamide layer had a contact angle of 33o." Please explain why this contact angle is lower than the similarly prepared TFC membrane.

As you know, contact angle of the membrane can be influenced by many parameters such as monomer concentration, reaction time, type of organic solution, post-treatment condition, etc. during IP reaction process. However, the reported value of the contact angle in our manuscript lies within the range of the previously reported contact angle of TFC membrane please look at (Kadhom et al., 2016; Lau et al., 2015)

6- Is it possible to draw the salt rejection with the salt flux?

Typically, salt flux is used in forward osmosis investigations to describe the selectivity of the membrane, while salt rejection is normally used in reverse osmosis studies. The salt rejection equation can be used when there is a feed solution involved in the process, while in FO, there are feed solution and draw solution. That is why the salt flux is used instead of the salt rejection.

7- What is the percentage of the salt in figure 7? Please add.

Testing conditions of Figure 7: feed solution: DI water and draw solution: 1M NaCl.

8- Please make a table to compare this work's results with similar work.

Table 1. Comparison of the performance of some TFC membranes from previous studies

Membrane	Feed solution	Draw solution	Water flux (L/m2 h)	Salt flux (g/m2 h)	Reference
TFC-PSU	DI water	1 M NaCl	36.58	6.8	This work.
HTI-TFC	DI water	1 M NaCl	15	4.5	(Ren and McCutcheon, 2014)
TFC-PAN	DI water	1 M NaCl	16	4	(Al-Furaiji et al., 2020)
Aquaporin TFC	DI water	1 M NaCl	9	4	(Xia et al., 2017)
TFC-M2 (CAB substrate)	DI water	1 M NaCl	6.81	5.88	(Ma et al., 2020)
TFC-CTA (HTI, commercial)	DI water	1 M NaCl	12.0	8.04	(Kwon et al., 2017)
CAB	DI water	1 M NaCl	9.0	3.78	(Ong et al., 2012)
PVDF nanofiber-PA	DI water	1 M NaCl	11.6	3.48	(Tian et al., 2013)
PSU /Silica-PA	DI water	1M NaCl	31	7.44	(Liu and Ng, 2015)
Oasys TFC	DI water	1M NaCl	30	50	(Cath et al., 2013)

References

Al-Furaiji, M., Kadhom, M., Kalash, K., Waisi, B. and Albayati, N.: Preparation of TFC Membranes Supported with Elelctrospun Nanofibers for Desalination by Forward Osmosis, Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., (March), 1–17, doi:10.5194/dwes-2020-9, 2020.

Cath, T. Y., Elimelech, M., McCutcheon, J. R., McGinnis, R. L., Achilli, A., Anastasio, D., Brady, A. R., Childress, A. E., Farr, I. V., Hancock, N. T., Lampi, J., Nghiem, L. D., Xie, M. and Yip, N. Y.: Standard Methodology for Evaluating Membrane Performance in Osmotically Driven Membrane Processes, Desalination, 312, 31–38, doi:10.1016/j.desal.2012.07.005, 2013.

Kadhom, M., Yin, J. and Deng, B.: A thin film nanocomposite membrane with MCM-41 silica nanoparticles for brackish water purification, Membranes (Basel)., 6(4), doi:10.3390/membranes6040050, 2016.

Kwon, S. J., Park, S. H., Park, M. S., Lee, J. S. and Lee, J. H.: Highly permeable and mechanically durable forward osmosis membranes prepared using polyethylene lithium ion battery separators, J. Memb. Sci., 544(March), 213–220, doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2017.09.022, 2017.

Lau, W. J., Ismail, A. F., Goh, P. S., Hilal, N. and Ooi, B. S.: Characterization methods of thin film composite nanofiltration membranes, Sep. Purif. Rev., 44(2), 135–156, doi:10.1080/15422119.2014.882355, 2015.

Liu, X. and Ng, H. Y.: Fabrication of layered silica-polysulfone mixed matrix substrate membrane for enhancing performance of thin-film composite forward osmosis membrane, J. Memb. Sci., 481, 148–163, doi:10.1016/j.memsci.2015.02.012, 2015.

Ma, J., Xiao, T., Long, N. and Yang, X.: The role of polyvinyl butyral additive in forming desirable pore structure for thin film composite forward osmosis membrane, Sep. Purif. Technol., 242(January), 116798, doi:10.1016/j.seppur.2020.116798, 2020.

Ong, R. C., Chung, T. S., Helmer, B. J. and De Wit, J. S.: Novel cellulose esters for forward osmosis membranes, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 51(49), 16135–16145, doi:10.1021/ie302654h, 2012.

Ren, J. and McCutcheon, J. R.: A new commercial thin film composite membrane for forward osmosis, Desalination, 343, 187–193, doi:10.1016/j.desal.2013.11.026, 2014.

Tian, M., Qiu, C., Liao, Y., Chou, S. and Wang, R.: Preparation of polyamide thin film composite forward osmosis membranes using electrospun polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF) nanofibers as substrates, Sep. Purif. Technol., 118, 727–736, doi:10.1016/j.seppur.2013.08.021, 2013.

Xia, L., Andersen, M. F., Hélix-Nielsen, C. and McCutcheon, J. R.: Novel Commercial Aquaporin Flat-Sheet Membrane for Forward Osmosis, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 56(41), 11919–11925, doi:10.1021/acs.iecr.7b02368, 2017.