We thank the editor and the reviewer for their thorough work on the manuscript. We have answered all points in detail and thus think we can achieve the publication of the manuscript now.

EDITOR
Please revise the manuscript according the comments of the reviewer (see below). In addition, I would suggest to run a spell-check. Here are a few suggestions:
Done. We used Microsoft Word to check the spelling of the final version. 2 more mistakes were found.

we look on the phase boundaries > we look at the phase boundaries
Done.

fluctiations > fluctuations
Done.

cautios > cautious
Done.

the corrections from \eta_d are small > the corrections of \eta_d (?)
Done.

but appear more or less unchanged > [not quite sure what this means?]
The sentence was corrected strongly. So no original content remains.

asymptic > asymptotic
Done.

than what would expect > than what would be expected
Done.

icoherent > incoherent
Done.

The contribution from \eta_1 > The contribution of \eta_1 (?)
Done.

Here, we determined the exponent from the quadratic power law > Here, we determined the deviation of the exponent of the quadratic power law from the ideal case of 2 [or something a bit more explicit]
Done.

In the references, please check capitalization.
Done.

REVIEWER #1

The article “The high-Q static scattering of 3-methyl pyridine/D2O mixtures without and with antagonistic salt” submitted by H. Frielinghaus et al. focuses the experimental high-Q SANS from certain mixtures in comparison to predicted Q^(-2) power-law scattering.
The idea is very good, the article is well-written and the method well explained. I therefore recommend this work for publication.

We thank the referee for this positive and supportive rating.

I do have a few comments that may be considered by the authors:
- Fig. 2. The first and main point concerns the presentation of scattering data. Power-law dependencies are always better seen on a double-logarithmic scale, where they appear as linear dependencies. In this case, the deviation from any predicted exponent will be shown as changes in the slope of the scattering curve in a certain Q range.

We changed the presentation of Fig.2 to double-logarithmic and changed the caption a little.

- Fig.2 caption. “The asymptotic high-Q scattering is fitted at Q >0.104 Å^(−1) (red lines).” But extrapolated to smaller Q? What are red lines for Q<0.104 Å^(−1)?

The red lines span the full Q-range to display the deviations at lower Q < 0.104 Å^(−1). We think that this extrapolation is useful.

- I think it's a bad idea to include Fig.1 unchanged compared to article [1] even without reference to the publication. At a minimum, I suggest changing the colour scheme.

We changed the color scaling. There the solvation effect is a little exaggerated, but possibly explains better what the situation is.

- Paragraph after Eq.(5). “dependencie” -> “dependence”

Done.

- The introduction of equation (8) is not obvious. A broader justification or references to such a mathematical technique in the literature is needed.

We added a citation [14] and explained a little further.