Reviewer 3:

1) Page 2, line 50: What is the “improved Ollar method”? Do the authors mean “modified Ollard”?

Here we mean a modified Ollard method. And we change the expression as reviewer’s suggestion in Line 52.

2) Page 8, line 234: “the simulated elemental content seems possibly much even than the experiments”. Please rephrase.

This sentence is rewritten as follows:

Due to the exclusion of convention in the electrolyte and the biphasic effect in the numerical calculation, the elemental content distribution in the deposited coatings is relatively homogeneous, and the elemental contents vary within a reasonable range.

3) What is the difference between Figs. 6a1-e1 and Figs. 6a2-e2? The caption for Fig. 6 needs to be rewritten.

Both Fig. (a-1)-(e-1) and Fig. (a-2)-(e-2) show the cross sections of deposited coatings. But Fig. (a-1)-(e-1) images were captured using SEM, while Fig. (a-2)-(e-2) were observed using OM.

The caption for Fig. 6 is rewritten as follows:

Morphology of cross-section and cracked coating surface deposited at (a) 5 A/dm^2 , (b) 10 A/dm^2 , (c) 15 A/dm^2, (d) 20 A/dm^2 and (e) 25 A/dm^2.

4) In page 9, line 267, the microcracking is explained by the claim that “the grain growth direction is weaker than that along the growth direction”. The reference given for this claim, Ref. 52, makes no mention of grain growth.

We misplaced the reference number. In Ref.52, the growth direction of columnar grains near the interface is investigated.

[52] A. Bastos, S. Zaefferer, D. Raabe, C. Schuh. Characterization of the microstructure and texture of nanostructured electrodeposited NiCo using electron backscatter diffraction (EBSD). Acta materialia, 2006, 54(9): 2451-2462.

5) In page 11, line 290, it is claimed that alpha-Fe is the stable phase for Fe content over 80%. In what alloy?

In Ref. 50, authors mentioned that the bcc α-Fe phase is stable for Fe concentration in excess of 80 at % at temperatures below 500℃. In our present study, the iron content in atom fraction in the deposits is close or beyond 80%.

[50] ZHANG Y, IVEY D G. Characterization of Co-Fe and Co-Fe-Ni soft magnetic films electrodeposited from citrate-stabilized sulfate baths. Materials Science and Engineering: B, 2007, 140(1-2): 15-22.

6) Page 11, line 293: “the solid solution phase α-Fe is supposed to incorporation of cobalt and nickel into iron”.

This sentence is rewritten as follows:

α-Fe is supposed to be the substitutional solid solution, which incorporates cobalt and nickel into iron.

7) Page 11, line 296: “a preferential orientation generated by electric crystallization”. The cited reference, Ref. 58, does not appear to make such a claim.

We misplaced the reference number. In Ref.58, the relationship between the current density and the preferred crystalline orientation is investigated.

[58] THIEMIG D, BUND A, TALBOT J B. Influence of hydrodynamics and pulse plating parameters on the electrocodeposition of nickel–alumina nanocomposite films. Electrochimica Acta, 2009, 54(9): 2491-2498.

We carefully double-checked the reference numbers in the paper.

8) Page 11, line 318: “microsturectures”.

This misspelling is changed.

9) Page 12, line 321: “lest noble”. And how can Fe2+ deposit on an ion?

The misspelling is changed.

According to Ref. 19, during NiCoFe ternary alloy deposition, the mixed metal intermediates $FeNi(III)_{ad}$, $FeCo(III)_{ad}$, and $NiCo(III)_{ad}$ and single-metal intermediates are formed and adsorbed at the cathode surface. Metal ions are reduced from above intermediates and the preference for high surface coverage by Fe intermediates caused inhibition of the Ni deposition.

[19] Y Zhuang, E.J. Podlaha. NiCoFe ternary alloy deposition: III. A mathematical model. Journal of the Electrochemical Society, 2003, 150(4): 225-233.

10) Fig. 9: The axis label “Degree of anomaly (dA)” is not defined in the text.

The degree of anomaly for ternary alloy codeposition can be described using the composition ratio value (CRV).

The axis label in Fig. 9 is changed.