

# 大气环境与生物能源课题组第三期学术沙龙

## 一篇SCI的自述之**回复审稿意见**

汇报人：郑燕飞 21级博士

指导老师：刘庆岭 教授 韩瑞 副教授

2022年4月2日



# CONTENTS

1. 孕育思路
2. 开展工作
3. 择刊投稿
4. 等待发表



# 01 孕育思路



# ◆ 孕育 Good idea



**发现问题**

**综述**

**硕博大论文**



**分析问题**

**关键影响因素**

**可实现性**



**解决问题**

**检索是否已有**

**设计开展试验**

# 02 开展工作



# ◆ 养育

表征



计算



绘图



润色



# 03 择刊投稿



## ◆ 选择比努力更重要

“如何选择期刊，期刊不仅是科学传播的平台，更是一种产业，有自己的需求，**要找到适合自己文章的期刊。**”



大气环境与生物能源课题组第一次学术沙龙  
<http://catalysis.tju.edu.cn/Home/Detail/77.htm>

# 04 等待发表



# ◆ 回复审稿意见

## 总述：如何回复审稿意见？

### ◆ 当收到审稿意见时，应仔细阅读其中所有评语（包括编辑评语和审稿人评语）

根据需要在稿件中作出相应调整，然后撰写一份详细的回复函，并在规定时间内之前返回，否则修改稿将被作为新稿处理。

### ◆ 编辑和/或审稿人的所有意见都必须回应

无论支持反对，均应该礼貌并有理有据地回复，不要不理睬或忽略审稿意见，因为这只会导致延迟。

### ◆ 回复函格式是把编辑和审稿人的意见复制下来，然后在各条意见下面逐条回应

当提到文中的改动时，在文中标记并给出页码和行号以便迅速查找。把修改前后的文字都复制在回复函中，让人一目了然你如何修改回应审稿意见。

原则/态度：所有问题逐条回答、  
态度端正礼貌回应

✓ 礼貌用语：非常感谢宝贵建议

✓ 指出根据建议做了什么，有哪些改动

✓ 修改之处做好标记

## ◆不同类型举例-客观建议

### ◆ 非技术性 通常是格式或内容上的简单修改

Comment 1: ★ 细节问题

On page 7, the Figure 1a in the sentence of as we ..., should be revised as Figure 1b.

Response:

According to the Reviewer's suggestion, the Figure 1a in the sentence of "as we ..." on Page 7 have been revised as Figure 1b. (Please see Page 8 Line 167)

Comment 2: ★★ 格式问题

Although the authors have made a systematic representation, the article did not carry out a complete summary at the end.

Response:

Thanks for Reviewer's suggestion. The complete summary and discussion have been replenished at the end of revised manuscript. (please see Page 18 Line 370-374)

Comment 3: ★ 引用文献

The authors should cite some literatures to clarify the advantages of oxygen vacancies and discuss more about mechanism from (ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces 2019, 11, 730-739)

Response:

Thanks for Reviewer's suggestion. The above literatures have been cited to clarify the advantages of oxygen vacancies in Introduction and discuss about mechanism on Page 4 Line 69.

## ◆不同类型举例-客观建议

### ◆非技术性 通常是格式或内容上的简单修改

Comment 4:★

语言问题

Some of the language and expressions should be carefully revised, appropriately

Response:

Thanks for the Reviewer's suggestion. The language and expressions have been carefully revised and appropriately polished.

*Revisions:*

The content of “Figure 6C shows that the Co 2p<sub>3/2</sub> of 12CoCuO<sub>x</sub>/CF and 12CoCuO<sub>x</sub>-R/CF were divided into two peaks at 779.3 and 780.6 eV assigned to Co<sup>3+</sup> and Co<sup>2+</sup>, respectively.” was changed to that of “Figure 5C shows that the Co 2p<sub>3/2</sub> of 12CoCu/CF and 12CoCu-R/CF are divided into two peaks at 779.3 and 780.6 eV assigned to Co<sup>3+</sup> and Co<sup>2+</sup>, respectively.” (Please see Page 13, Line 274)

# ◆不同类型举例-客观建议

## ◆ 技术性

通常需要补充实验或表征进一步解释

Comment 4: ★ **补表征**

The authors said “Defective Ultrafine MnOx Nanoparticles Confined within Carbon Matrix” **But there is less characterization to confirm the effect of carbon.** (1) Please increase the range of Raman to 1800 cm<sup>-1</sup>; (2) Add the XPS figure of C; (3) Discuss the effect of C in mechanism.

**Response:**

According to the Reviewer’s advisable comment, the related characterizations for confirming the effect of carbon were carried out.

Comment 5: ★ **补实验**

Please add some experiments about water tolerant tests in 1.5, 3.5 and 7.5 vol.% H<sub>2</sub>O.

**Response:**

Thanks for Reviewer’s suggestion. The tolerance to H<sub>2</sub>O with different volume fraction (1.5, 3.5, 5.5 and 7.5 vol.%) have been investigated. The details have been added in revised manuscript. (please see Figure 6c on Page 16 and Line 327-348)

Comment 6: ★★ **深入分析**

Page 19. A clear explanation for the observed promoting effect of Co on the Pt dispersion should be given.

**Response:**

Thank you for your suggestion. We are so grateful for your valuable suggestion, which is very helpful for us to improve the level of our paper. In the light of this useful suggestion, ...was added to verify ...The detailed revisions were shown below.

## ◆ 不同类型举例-不太赞同

### ◆ 技术性

通常需要补充实验或表征进一步解释

Comment 7:



实验参数问题

Combine with the actuality, it is necessary to solve the VOCs pollution in high GHSV. Please explain why “The gas hourly space velocity (GHSV) of reaction was around 18, 600 mL/(g·h).”

Response:

参数选择依据+补充

Thanks for Reviewer’s suggestion. Generally, to make pollutants and catalysts fully contact and react, the space velocity of VOCs treated with catalytic oxidation technology is controlled at 2000-5000 mL/(g·h) in industry. In our work, it is found that better results can be achieved even at higher space velocity. This is mainly because the catalyst has high surface area, small particle sizes, abundant oxygen vacancies, and good reducibility at low temperature. **In addition, the catalytic performance of the MnOx-NA catalyst for acetone oxidation with different space velocity has been investigated. (please see Figure S19 on Page S18 in supporting information)** As shown in Figure S19, with the increasing of space velocity, the  $T_{90}$  also increased. It is indicated that the MnOx-NA catalyst is sensitive to space velocity, which could be due to the difference in contact time between reactants and catalyst.<sup>1-2</sup> And we also consulted many literatures and compared with them, as shown in the Table R1.

# ◆不同类型举例-不认同的观点

## ◆ 技术性

通常需要补充实验或表征进一步解释

Comment 8: ★★☆☆ 实验结果与表征“不符”

H<sub>2</sub>-TPR reduction peak at ~ 200 °C, catalytic reaction at 160 °C for MnOx-NA?  
How to set a relationship between them.

Response: 合理分析+文献支撑

Thanks for Reviewer's suggestion. It is general accepted that the reduction peak and catalytic activity are correlative.<sup>1-3</sup> The lower the reduction peak temperature, the better the catalytic activity. However, this does not mean that the reduction temperature should be consistent with T<sub>90</sub>. As shown in Figure R1, the T<sub>90</sub> of catalysts is obviously lower than the reduction temperature. 实际上, 反应条件是不同的...此外, 催化活性(T90)不仅与催化剂的还原性有关, 还与催化剂的其他性能有关, 如比表面积、氧迁移率、氧空位含量等。因此, 我们可以通过H<sub>2</sub>-TPR判断催化剂的还原性, 但不能得到T90的值。

## ◆ 不同类型举例-不赞同

### ◆ 技术性

通常需要补充实验或表征进一步解释

Comment 9: ★★★★★

专业问题

“At this stage, a new peak appears at 7° in the XRD, which indicates the production of mesoporous particles”. Please explain the phase and effect of the peak at 7°.

Response:

承认目前分析的不足+合理的分析

Thanks for Reviewer's suggestion, we have checked and considered the points mentioned above. There a new peak was detected in the Mn-BDC-N. According to Gu and coworkers, the mesoporous structure has a distinct diffraction peak in the small-angle XRD.<sup>1</sup> However, the diffraction peak at 7° mentioned in this paper is not obtained by small-angle measurement, so it is inaccurate that a peak at 7° in the XRD indicates the production of mesoporous particles. To explore the pore diameter distribution of the Mn-BDC-N, the N<sub>2</sub> adsorption-desorption test has been carried out. As shown in Figure S2, the Mn-BDC-N showed mesoporous structure and the relative description has been corrected in revised manuscript. (please see Page 8 Line 151-154)

## ◆ 写在最后

Thanks again to Editors and Reviewers for the valuable suggestions, which makes our manuscript gain further improvements. We hope that the Editors and Reviewers will be satisfied with the revision for the manuscript.

**再分享一些常用的回复句式用于一对一回答问题的开头使用：**

- **We gratefully appreciate for your valuable suggestion/ comment.**
- **Thank you for your rigorous consideration/ comment/ nice suggestion/ advice.**
- **We gratefully thanks for the precious time the reviewer spent making constructive remarks.**
- **We feel sorry for the inconvenience brought to the reviewer.**
- **Thank you so much for your careful check.**
- **We totally understand the reviewer's concern.**

## ◆ 互动环节



审稿人：**论文创新性不强**

回复：感谢您的意见。我们这篇论文原稿的引言部分没有把新意、重要性写清楚；鉴于此，我们已经加强了引言部分，把创新性强调出来。本文的创新性就在于……

**现在是自由问答时间**



# Thanks.

