The work presented in this manuscript is quite interesting, contains valuable experimental results and, the most important thing, the authors procedure to analyse experimental data is well described. However, there are some important issues that should be addressed prior to manuscript publication.  
1 Concerning the results presented in Figure 2, I cannot see any difference between A-C and B-D graphics. In the manuscript, figures 2A and 2B are described in the first paragraph of the Results & discussion section. I haven't found any reference in the text to figures 2C and 2D.  
2 On page 11, authors say:  
"It is also worth noting that the EXAFS can be fitted with a structural model made up by a first  
and second coordination shell of oxygen, both containing 4 atoms, with a slight improvement in  
the fit quality (see Fig. 2B)....."  
According to figure caption, the structural model with two coordination shells, both containing 4 atoms corresponds to the fits showed in figures 2C and 2D.  
3 In page 12, first paragraph, figure 4 is described.  
"Fig. 4 shows a comparison of XANES calculations for CuL4 complex in presence (red lines) and in absence (green lines) of hydrogen atoms in the cluster. The inclusion of hydrogen atoms determines a substantial variation in the simulated XANES spectrum, in particular in the energy regions indicated by the arrows."  
There are no arrows in figure 4. Maybe authors refer to arrows include in figure 3, which by the way, are not explained in the figure caption.  
4 Concerning LSV measurements, authors say in the manuscript that the potential ranges from 1.2 to -0.4V, however X-axis scale in figure 6 does not match this potential interval. Why?  
5. Which is the global time LSV measurements last?  
6. On page 12, last paragraph authors say that  
".....figure 6 shows the time evolution of coefficients related to the two standards used for the linear combination."  
There is no time scale in this graphic, please, change the figure including a time scale, or better described the actual figure in the manuscript.  
In conclusion, there are many points concerning results presentation that should be much better explained and/or depicted.