Overall, the concept of the evaluation of tracer characteristics and applicability is indeed an important factor to consider and conduct thorough research on. However, an explanation of its importance within the introduction is limited and could be more emphasized since it is the reason for the research to be conducted. As for the methods, results, and conclusion, there seems to be a lack of sense of flow which leads to confusion to the research purpose as one reads through. In the case of the flow from the method to the results, it was hard to catch what results were obtained from which part of the methods explained in prior. I think the main reason for the confusion is due to the fact that results based on the methods explained were partially included within the method section instead of the results section. An example of this is the part related to Figure 3. Also, the flow from the results to the conclusion seems to be a bit sudden. In the conclusion it says that "an algorithm has been made for the choice of optimal primary tracers". However, the results only explain about a specific case for EtOF and EtOAc at a certain S_{or}. Hence, this makes me wonder whether this may be called an "algorithm" or "a case study".

Some additional opinions are as the following:

- Terminology should be unified. There are numerous terms used for the same situati on. Examples include "shut-in period" & "shut-down period" & "soak time", "1/2 h ydrolysis" & "half-life".

- More explanation related to the research background could be helpful. Especially rel ated to the range of temperature. An explanation of the typical temperature range f or a reservoir of EOR would help understand the range of applied temperature duri ng the experiments.

- Additional information about the experiment settings seems to be needed. It seemed that the experiment was *introduced* but not *explained*. What were the experimental co nditions and what do they each represent within the revoir environment? What kind of procedure was taken to conduct the experiment? Is this experiment setting typic al for this kind of study? This experiment seems to be the key of this research, but there seems to be no emphasis and explanation about it.

- In figure 3, is it possible for the K-value to be different at the same temperature? T he authors plotted the 1/2 hydrolysis according to the temperature and K-values, bu t the K-value is the function of temperature. Also, what is the exact meaning of gra y shade? The message of figure and the explanation for the figure is not sufficiently written in the text.

- References are need for some explanations. What are the references for equations 3 and 4 (units are also needed)? What research proposed that the optimal time for the soak period is usually 2-15 days (line 158)?

- Figure 4 seems to be quite similar to the figure used in ref29. If this is referred to, adding the reference to it should be considered. Also, the message that this figure i s intended to convey doesn't seem to be explained that well. In the description, it's

talking about the equilibration of ester between the oil and water phase. However, t he circulation sign is misleading in this sense, since it gives the impression of mixin g rather than equilibration.

- Figure 5 could be drawn in a more effective way other than the current method. T he 3D graph seems to be unnecessary since for each graph there are only two varia bles. it the four graphs were plotted in one, then the 3D graph would have been m eaningful. However, since this is not the case, there seems to be no reason for this kind of graph style. Also, this type of graph is actually misleading due to the fact t hat the shadings at the bottom of the columns do not convey any messages. This ca n confuse readers to think there is something behind this shade of colour, so it wo uld be recommended to use a 2D line graph or something else.