We thank the Reviewer for their constructive criticism and suggestions for improving the paper. We have found them very useful and we have implemented changes and clarifications in the revised manuscript accordingly. All new or modified text in the revised manuscript has been highlighted using red colour. Below is our detailed response to the reviewers' comments:

Comment 1. The article presents an interesting research topic. Please consider reviewing the abstract a highlight the novelty, major findings and conclusions?

Response 1: We have modified the manuscript according to the Reviewer's suggestion.

Comment 2. The results are merely described and is limited to comparing the experimental observation. The authors are encouraged to include a discussion section and critically discuss more the observations from this investigation with existing literature.

Response 2: According to the Reviewer's suggestion, a sub-section 3.8 "Discussion" has been included with the discussion of results. In line with the Reviewer's suggestions, an in-depth revision on the results has been undertaken to compare our results with other studies in the field of electropolishing processes. In the studies published to date there are substantial differences in the experimental methodologies employed as well as in the electropolishing parameters and materials evaluated. These factors should be borne in mind in any comparative analysis since they substantially condition the results obtained. For this reason, only a partial comparison of results has been possible.

Comment 3. Suggestion of literature:

Response 3: Authors have found the suggested literature is of interest. Thus, two of the five suggested books have been added to the manuscript.

Comment 4. Improve the conclusions

Response 4: The conclusions have been improved according to the Reviewer's suggestion.