

**Dear editor and Reviewers:**

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewer's insightful comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Milk electrolyte concentration and electrical conductivity: Promising indicators for the early diagnosis of lactation mastitis" (Manuscript ID: 77610). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have carefully taken the reviewer's comments into account and have made corrections, hoping to meet with approval. We hope this revision can make our paper more acceptable. The corrections were addressed point by point below.

**Respond to the comments of Reviewer 1:**

1. Change the title of the paper to reflect the goal.

Response: Thanks for your constructive comments. According to your suggestions, we have modified the title to be clearer to reflect the goal.

2. Evaluate the study abstract and work on shortening it to avoid extravagance in interpretation.

Response: Thanks for your advice. Your suggestion means a lot to us. Yes, it would be more concise and understandable if we make it shorter.

3. Rewrite the study's introduction using more recent references, and devote the final paragraph of the introduction to the study's purpose.

Response: Thanks for your advice. We had added more recent references in the study's introduction and devote the final paragraph of the introduction to the study's purpose according to your suggestions.

4. There were no illustrations or charts in the paper. I believe that addressing this point is critical for the reader.

Response: Thanks for your advice. There is a figure about the pathogenesis of LM in the article, and we had modified the figure, so that readers can understand more clearly.

5. Rewrite the conclusion in light of the findings.

Response: Thanks for your advice. We had rewritten the conclusion according to your suggestions.

6. Update references based on previous changes.

Response: Thanks for your kind reminder. We had updated references based on previous changes.

7. After making the necessary changes, a review is required to avoid typographical errors.

Response: Thanks for your kind reminder. After making the necessary changes, we had reviewed the whole review to avoid typographical errors.

**Respond to the comments of Reviewer 2:**

1. good review

**Response:** Thanks for your review of our manuscript.

Thanks for your reminding. We have signed again as required.