Reviewer #1: This revised version of manuscript was improved and text is more clear than  
the previous versions. In my opinion the manuscript can be accepted but some  
points should be observed by the authors for the final version of  
manuscript:  
Author’s response

Dear Editor   
Thank you for all your time and help.   
1. Page 2, line 36: "Anal. Methods", please change by "analytical methods".  
Author’s response

It has been corrected.

2. A comment must be included in manuscript saying that despite the 200  
fold-times preconcentration factor, it was still not enough to determine Hg  
in the evaluated real samples.  
Author’s response

It has been mentioned

3. English language should be again revised.

Author’s response

The English of the manuscript is revised carefully.

The authors have corrected the text in accordance with reviewer suggestions  
and therefore it should be accepted for publication.  
  
In my opinion, this manuscript should:   
be published as is  
  
If manuscript is suitable for publishing, referees recommendation:   
Original scientific paper

Author’s response

I’d like to thanks the reviewers for their valuable time and suggestion.