**RESPONSES FOR REVIEWER #A**

We would like to thank you for your comments and we kindly appreciate your collaboration concerning our manuscript.



Answers to your comments are detailed bellow.

**Comment 1**

Please present a scheme of the 2CPE equivalent circuit that was used for  
impedance spectra fitting in this version of the manuscript in Fig. 5 (file  
6729-37434-1-SP). Currently, the previously applied, incorrect equivalent  
circuit is still given there.

**Answer 1**

We agree with your remark. The equivalent circuit presented in Fig.5 (file  
6729-37434-1-SP) is not the correct one. In round 3 revised manuscript, we presented a scheme of the 2CPE equivalent circuit as follows:

**Uncorrected equivalent circuit Scheme of 2CPE equivalent circuit**

(File 6729-37434-1-SP) (Round 3 submission)

**Comment 2**

Please make a reference in the main text to Table S1 (file  
6729-40065-1-SP), which shows parameters obtained by applying the 2CPE  
model.  
**Answer 2**

Yes, In the Round 3 revised manuscript; we have mentioned in the main text the table we have given in the Supplementary material. We denoted it by “Table S1”. Hence, we have added in the EIS analysis section, lines 155-156, the following sentence:

The *Rct* values of table II represent *R3* values of fitting results reported in Table S1 of the Supplementary material.

**Comment 3**

The circuit parameters given in the table in file 6729-37447-1-SP do not  
refer to the 2CPE model. Therefore, please completely remove file  
6729-37447-1-SP from the submission.

**Answer 3**

Yes, we have replaced the incorrect file 6729-37447-1-SP by a new corrected one.

**Comment 4**

Please present the R3 values from Table S1 as Rct values in Table II.

**Answer 4**

As you suggested, in the Round 3 revised manuscript we have presented the R3 values from Table S1 as Rct values in Table II.