Reviewer 1’s comments:

The choice of experiments and figures to highlight the findings of the investigation seem logical and well planned. Overall, I am in favor of the manuscript, however, the grammatical errors and poor sentence construction is a bit too apparent, thereby rendering the manuscript in its current form not fit for publications. It is advised that the manuscript undergoes major text editing. Examples are few are listed below:

Line 13: remove the word "screen"

Line 15: unnecessary space before ")"

Line 22: "oxidizes" does not fit in very well in this sentence

Line 71: vairiables" ??

The above are examples of multiple grammatical errors and poor sentence structure throughout the manuscript. All of these need to be fixed.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s observation. The authors have revised this problem as the reviewer suggested (see more in green highlight throughout the revised manuscript).
Reviewer 2’s comments:

Review for “Experimental-design-guided approach for the removal of fenobucarb by the electrochemical-chlorine technique”

This is a revised manuscript based on previous “Degradation of Fenobucarb by Electrochemical Oxidation Process: Influencing Factors, Factorial Design, and Intermediates Identification”. As I can see, notable improvements have been made, especially the language. The highlighted part in yellow indicated that it has been revised. I found that other parts need extensive language editing in the same way.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s observation. The authors have revised this problem as the reviewer suggested (see more in green highlight throughout the revised manuscript).

Besides, please address my following questions.

1. The title is suggested to change to “Response surface analysis of fenobucarb removal by the electrochemically generated chlorine”.

   Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s suggestion. That’s a great idea, We will replace the title of research.

2. The pie figures for mass balance are not really necessary, because they have been stated in the text.

   Response: Yes. The authors agree with the reviewer’s comment. The authors have re-organized figures. You can see more in the revised manuscript.

3. The last item of the conclusion section is not really drawn from this study. It is not proper to include it here.

   Response: The authors have removed the last item of the conclusion.

4. The drawing of figure 1 needs to be improved

   Response: Figure 1 was improved. You can see in the revised manuscript. Many thanks.
The authors hope that your comments were properly taken into account in the revised manuscript, and our responses would satisfy insightful comments and valuable suggestions of the reviewer.