Modifications made to manuscript:

Reviewer 1.

1. English need to be revised to take into account some errors. Please revise the whole manuscript.

Authors: The manuscript was revised and the items marked in manuscript were corrected.

2.The graphical abstract must include the units on the “y” axis.

Authors: The graphical abstract include labeling of Y axis.

3.Peak labels corresponding to Miller’s indexes shown in figure 1, must be revised/corrected,

i. e. (010) label does not correspond to the reflection indicated in the JPCDS card 22-0700.

Authors: Thanks for this remark. Actually two peaks close to 60 degrees were wrong indexed. The revised figure labels correctly both peaks according to most recent database.

4. In the introduction part, the authors use the words “chlorine” and “chloride” as if they were

The same specie? Is that correct?

Authors: Chlorine and chloride are not the same molecule and they are correctly mentioned in introduction section.

5. The authors start to describe the structure of LDH and assert that “The partial substitution of the divalent cations by trivalent ones induces a positive charge in the layer “. This sentence does not make sense because the LDH has already some trivalent cations occupying positions of divalent ones.

For the sake of clarity, it is advisable to discuss this sentence in terms of the replacement of MII cations in the Mg(OH)2 by MIII cations.

Authors: The sentence was corrected as follows: “The presence of the MIII cations as well as MII cations induces a positive charge in the layer, which is balanced by the anions between the hydroxylated layers, where water molecules are also present”.

6. At the end of the introduction, it could be better if the authors explain why the replacement of OH- groups by F- species may modify the polarity/polarisability at the LDH surface.

Authors: A short sentence was included at end of introduction regarding changes in polarity/polarizability as a consequence of the partial replacement of OH- by F-. Further a reference is included.

7. In the experimental part, the authors indicate the brand of the commercial reagents, except for aluminium tri-sec-butoxide.

Authors: The supplier of ATB is mentioned in revised version.

8.In the sorption experiments the authors mention that they “centrifuge solutions”. That is wrong, they may centrifuge “suspensions”.

Authors: The mistake was corrected.

9.For the FTIR analysis, the authors mention that OH stretching bands were integrated and compared values for the samples. Did the weight of analyzed samples was the same in all cases?

Authors: Of course not, even if weight the sample was the same the spectra remain incomparable at absolute units because the chemical composition changed. The right procedure for analyses was to normalize the spectra (helping us by an external reference band, provided by EZ OMNIC 32 software) and after that the absorption bands can be integrated.

10.Please check the title of reference [4].

Authors: The spelling mistake in word “byproduct” was corrected.

Reviewer 2

1. In general, the manuscript has several spelling and grammatical errors that must be corrected. For example, on page 2, Lines 4-5: There is a grammatical mistake in the phrase: “CHCl3 and CHBr3 presents low concentrated in water”, where it should say: CHCl3 and CHBr3 presents in low concentration in water or low concentrated CHCl3 and CHBr3 presents in water.

Authors: The whole manuscript was revised. The English language usage was significantly improved.

2. The phrases marked must be corrected.

Authors: The whole manuscript was revised. The English language usage was significantly improved.

3.On page 4, the authors define LDH in a general way as “lamellar hydroxycarbonates of magnesium and aluminum ”, but that would be the definition only for the hydrotalcite, a specific mineral belonging to this family of materials.

Authors: Reviewer is right, we have deleted the phrase “lamellar hydroxycarbonates of magnesium and aluminum” and description remained in a general way.

4. On page 7, last paragraph. Authors do not mention whether the band integration experiments attributed to the OH- and F- groups were normalized according to the mass of each sample. If this was not the case, the results presented would not be valid.

Authors: Of course not, even if weight the sample was the same the spectra remain incomparable at absolute units because the chemical composition changed. The right procedure for analyses was to normalize the spectra (helping us by an external reference band, provided by EZ OMNIC 32 software) and after that the absorption bands can be integrated. In other words, the comparison of bands between samples is only possible if they are referred to an external band.

5. In Figure 4, the scales of each image are not observed.

Authors: The scale was included only for first image, as mentioned in corresponding caption figure, the scale is valid for three images.

6. In the whole discussion of results, sometimes the authors wrote "Figure" and other times "figure ", this should be homogenized.

Authors: The term “Figure” is now homogenized as requested.