

We would like to thank the Editor and the anonymous referees for considering our manuscript as suitable for publication in ACP after minor revisions. We are grateful for all the comments and suggestions provided that helped us to significantly improve the quality of the article.

Editor's comments:

"There is one outstanding question from referee 2 that needs to be addressed in a rebuttal and through revisions to the manuscript. Please also take care to find and correct the many typos in the manuscript that referee 1 mentioned."

Our responses to the comments provided together with the changes made in the revised manuscript are provided below.

Referee 1:

However, I feel that the final manuscript version should once more be very thoroughly checked as it contains typos which must be corrected prior to acceptance of the manuscript.

I would rate this a technical correction. If done, the paper can be accepted, no re-review needed.

Author's response: We are very happy that the referee has found our response letter and revised article satisfactory. The article was again proof-read to address the technical corrections.

Referee 2:

Figure 2B is using a linear fit to calculate the yield and a statistical analysis was carried out to show that this analysis was valid. However, by eye this is not a linear trend as there is clear curvature. Why were the points that are used selected to represent the linear portion? Please expand the analysis to show the variation found when a different range of initial points are used to provide uncertainty values for the assumptions that are made here

Author's response: We agree, the selections of the linearity range as well as the selection of the linear regression model in Fig 2B could have been better justified. We have repeated the linear regression analysis after increasing the number of data points included by 1, starting from the original number of data points (five). However, the values of adjusted R^2 , standard errors (uncertainties) of the linear regression coefficients (slopes), values of standardized residuals as well as p-values were always within an acceptable range. Interestingly, it is rather difficult to define the data range, in which the linear regression analysis is applicable, via the obtained values of the regression parameters. This is true despite the clearly visible curving of the plot in Fig. 2B.

Changes in the revised manuscript: In Fig. 2B, the number of data points used for the linear regression analysis was increased by 3, Fig. 2B was revised. If the criteria of the standardized residual values <3 are applied, none of these points can be excluded based on the results presented in Table S2. Following this change, the linear regression analysis was carried out

until the curve reached a clear plateau (after the 8th data point). This in turn decreased the molar yield of 4NC under basic pH conditions from 0.4 to 0.3.

Note that these changes did not alter the overall conclusions presented in the manuscript as the yield of 4NC at pH=9 is still significantly higher (within the reported uncertainties) as compared with the yield of this product under acidic pH conditions (pH=2). Table S2, the main text and the SI were revised accordingly. Furthermore, Fig. S4 was added in the SI presenting a more detailed analysis of the linear regression analysis results for the experimental data shown in Fig. 2A and 2B. Fig. S4 is now referenced in the caption of the revised Fig. 2 in the main text. We believe that following these changes the selection of the data points used for the linear regression analysis in Fig. 2B is now much better justified.