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In the original article, unfortunately, the anode potential of the chronoamperometry experiments has not been reported. A correction has been made to theMaterials and Methods, Experimental Setup, paragraph two:

“ A Gamry PCI4/300 potentiostat (Gamry Instruments, Warminster, USA) was used for analyzing electrochemical activities of the anode in a 3 electrode setup with a saturated calomel electrode (SCE) as reference electrode (KE11, Sensortechnik Meinsberg, Germany) in all experiments. All chronoamperometry experiments were carried out at an anode potential of −0. 241 V vs. SCE, except during the cleaning step in the electrochemical cleaning experiments. The potentials given in V vs. SHE were calculated by adding 0. 241 V to the potential measured vs. the SCE reference electrode. Counter electrodes were made from a platinum mesh (No. 900338, Chempur GmbH, Germany). All electrode positions are depicted in Figure 2. The default three-electrode positions are chosen as to minimize losses caused by uncompensated resistance (iR-drop).”

The authors apologize for this inconvenience and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.