Comment on mr-2021-18

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "An electrochemical cell for in operando ^{13}C nuclear magnetic resonance investigations of carbon dioxide/carbonate processes in aqueous solution" by Sven Jovanovic et al., Magn. Reson. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/mr-2021-18-RC2, 2021

Assessment criteria during the full review

Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of *MR*?

YES

Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? All submitted papers are assumed to report on new observations and/or new theory; there is no need to draw attention to the novelty in title, abstract, or conclusions.

YES

Are substantial conclusions reached?

No

Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

No

Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists with reasonable effort?

YES

Are numerical data accompanied by error estimates with a description of the methods used to obtain these estimates?

No

For papers reporting molecular dynamics simulations, is it clearly stated how the MD simulations support the experimental evidence and vice versa?

N/A

Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own

new/original contribution?

YES

Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

YES

Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

YES

Is the overall presentation well-structured and clear?

Is the language fluent and precise?

Yes

Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

YES (repetitive statements noticed).

Fig.4 needs to be more clearly presented.

Are the number and quality of references appropriate?

It appears, the number of references is excessive.

Is the amount and quality of the supporting information and supplementary material appropriate?

N/A