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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **I note that the manuscript deals with a very specialized field - DEE which involves short-lived radicals - using CIDNP spectroscopy, which is a particularly suitable method but is rarely applied.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** |  **"Experimental Validation of Marcus Cross-Relations Using Time-Resolved CIDNP Spectroscopy"** |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **No but I put a phrase *“*This work provides the first systematic application of the Marcus cross-relation with experimentally derived temperature-dependent reorganization energies for short-lived radicals.”** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **Yes correct**  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **Yes but I suggest more recent studies** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? |  My opinion it’s a suitable |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Weaknesses and Concerns**1. **Insufficient Discussion of Discrepancies**The discrepancy between experimental and calculated rate constants (e.g., a two-orders-of-magnitude difference in the GMP(-H)•/TyrO− case) is acknowledged but not sufficiently explained. The authors should explore possible causes (e.g., solvent reorganization, neglected entropic factors, or secondary reactions).
2. **Excessive Theoretical Density**Certain sections—especially those related to diffusion correction and electrostatic work functions—are presented with dense mathematical formalisms but lack intuitive physical interpretations. This may alienate non-specialist readers.
3. **Limited Contextualization with Recent Literature**Although foundational references are included, the manuscript would benefit from a comparative discussion with more recent studies (past 3–5 years) to highlight its methodological advancement.
4. **Clarity of Presentation**The manuscript would be improved by adding a schematic diagram summarizing the studied radical systems and their interrelated reactions to help readers grasp the overall reaction network.

 **Recommendations for Improvement*** Add a dedicated subsection discussing the causes and implications of large discrepancies between theoretical and experimental rate constants.
* Include a visual schematic summarizing the radical pairs, DEE reactions, and CIDNP pathways.
* Expand the literature context with relevant citations from the last 3–5 years.
* Provide more intuitive commentary on the physical meaning behind the mathematical models, especially Equations (20–24).

 **Final Recommendation: Major Revision**While the study is scientifically valuable and suitable for publication, substantial revision is required to address the analytical discrepancies and to enhance clarity for a broader scientific audience. |  |
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