Reviewer #4

Answers to Reviewer#4

I really appreciate your effort to improve the manuscript.

Thank you for your kind words.

After reviewing the revised version of the manuscript, I have just a few more corrections for the

new version;

1. Section 3.3.1: the sensitivity is the slope of the calibration curve. So the unit of your sensitivity should be “µA/mM cm2”. Did you get the value of 2.28 from the regression equation of the calibration curve linear part? If yes, please correct the unit.

Yes you are right we have made changes to unit now. Thank you.

1. Explanation of the figures in the manuscript body flows generally in an order. You explain figure 6 first in the manuscript and then you explain figure 5. This is a confusion.

Appology, now we have corrected order of figures in text.

1. Figure 4a, increase the width of the lines for consistency of the manuscript.

OK, we have increased the width of lines in Figure 4a.

1. 4- I am very confused about figure 6. Concentration of NaOH should have impact on glucose electro-oxidation. But according to graph 1M shows higher response? So why did you choose 0.1M NaOH to use? What about lower than 0.1M NaOH? Figure 6B is not clear. The CV shape is totally different from Figure 5A or 6A? Why? Unites are not written, what is the y-axis? Numerical values should be amended for againconsistency. Please think about Fig 6. I hope this will help.

Yes you are right that glucose oxidation response is higher at 1M concentration, but we chose 0.1M NaOH because electrode exhibited best stability at this concentration. At higher concentration (0.1M) modified electrode strip off. Also at lower concentration (0.05M) glucose oxidation peaks were not prominent. Figure 6B is different from 6A and 5A as this is a modified electrode response without glucose and rest of the two responses are with glucose. This response matches with Figure 4A i.e., modified electrode without glucose response in 0.1M NaOH.