The authors have made some efforts to improve the manuscript, following the remarks. However, in many crucial cases either they misunderstood, or they did not understand the remark.

For example (enumeration of the remarks according to previous review):

Remark 2: This remark did not refer to add more details. Just, not to use so much imperative form, especially in the experimental section.

Remark 3: **The chemistry shown in Figure 2B is unacceptable for any polymer chemist** and it can not appear in a journal such as *polymers*. Free radical copolymerization is not a stepwise process. All monomers are reacting simultaneously. Still, the authors show this reaction in two steps.

Moreover, I can not understand the argument concerning C18. As stated in section 2.1, line 117 C18 is a methacrylate monomer and a, in principle, it can be copolymerized.

Remark 6: The authors tried to make appropriate changes.

However, I do not understand many things in their effort to give an explanation.

First, unless I missed it, no reference to a work in Mayri etc. is cited.

Second, why SDS is called a biosurfactant? Is there any reference that pure SDS is an effective antibacterial agent? In fact, in ref. 32 the term "SDS" is not used, while in ref. 31 it is shown that SDS has no suppression zone (Figure 10).

Remark 7: Though I do not find convincing the initial argument ("..unreacted substances can reach a state that will not easily release.."), I accept that the present work is a proof of concept and the biocompatibility aspects should be ameliorated.