

The *South African Journal of Science* follows a double-anonymous peer review model but encourages Reviewers and Authors to publish their anonymised review reports and response letters, respectively, as supplementary files after manuscript review and acceptance. For more information, see [Publishing peer review reports](#).

### Peer review history for:

Karels S, Felix C, Pasupathi S. Development of unsupported IrO<sub>2</sub> nano-catalysts for polymer electrolyte membrane water electrolyser applications. *S Afr J Sci*. 2024;120(3/4), Art. #16026.

<https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/16026>

#### HOW TO CITE:

Development of unsupported IrO<sub>2</sub> nano-catalysts for polymer electrolyte membrane water electrolyser applications [peer review history]. *S Afr J Sci*. 2024;120(3/4), Art. #16026.

<https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2024/16026/peerreview>

#### Reviewer A: Round 1

**Date completed:** 09 September 2023

**Recommendation:** Revisions required

**Conflicts of interest:** None

Does the manuscript fall within the scope of SAJS?

Yes/No

Is the manuscript written in a style suitable for a non-specialist and is it of wider interest than to specialists alone?

Yes/No

Does the manuscript contain sufficient novel and significant information to justify publication?

Yes/No

Do the Title and Abstract clearly and accurately reflect the content of the manuscript?

Yes/No

Is the research problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes/No

Are the methods described comprehensively?

Yes/No

Is the statistical treatment appropriate?

Yes/No/Not applicable/Not qualified to judge

Do you believe somebody with more methodological expertise (in the area of this study) than yourself needs to review this?

Yes/No

If yes, can you suggest the type of expertise needed

**Not applicable**

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the research results?

Yes/Partly/No

Please rate the manuscript on overall contribution to the field

Excellent/Good/**Average**/Below average/Poor

Please rate the manuscript on language, grammar and tone

Excellent/**Good**/Average/Below average/Poor

Is the manuscript succinct and free of repetition and redundancies?

Yes/No

Are the results and discussion confined to relevance to the objective(s)?

Yes/No

The number of tables in the manuscript is Too few/ <b>Adequate</b> /Too many/Not applicable
The number of figures in the manuscript is Too few/ <b>Adequate</b> /Too many/Not applicable
Is the supplementary material relevant and separated appropriately from the main document? Yes/No/ <b>Not applicable</b>
Please rate the manuscript on overall quality Excellent/Good/ <b>Average</b> /Below average/Poor
Is appropriate and adequate reference made to other work in the field? <b>Yes/No</b>
Is it stated that ethical approval was granted by an institutional ethics committee for studies involving human subjects and non-human vertebrates? Yes/No/ <b>Not applicable</b>
If accepted, would you recommend that the article receives priority publication? Yes/ <b>No</b>
Are you willing to review a revision of this manuscript? Yes/ <b>No</b>
Select a recommendation: Accept / <b>Revisions required</b> / Resubmit for review / Decline
With regard to our policy on ' <a href="#">Publishing peer review reports</a> ', do you give us permission to publish your anonymised peer review report alongside the authors' response, as a supplementary file to the published article? Publication is voluntary and only with permission from both yourself and the author. <b>Yes/No</b>
<b>Comments to the Author:</b>  Improve the quality of the figures.  There is not much difference in the electrochemical properties of the synthesized and commercial IrO <sub>2</sub> as shown in Table-3, however, the CP analysis shows a big difference in performance. that's why, you need to explain more with appropriate references.

---

### Author response to Reviewer A: Round 1

Improve the quality of the figures AUTHOR: The quality of Figures 1, 5, 6, and 7 were improved for easier interpretation. The Tafel plots were reworked and plotted as separate figures to make it easier to interpret the data. There is not much difference in the electrochemical properties of the synthesized and commercial IrO <sub>2</sub> as shown in Table-3, however, the CP analysis shows a big difference in performance. that's why, you need to explain more with appropriate references. AUTHOR: Additional references were included in the manuscript, especially to the electrochemical analyses, to support the improved performances of the synthesized IrO <sub>2</sub> catalysts over the commercial IrO <sub>2</sub> catalyst. The commercial IrO <sub>2</sub> is an amorphous type material, which is known to be more active but less stable than its more crystalline counterparts. Moreover, the XRD patterns of commercial IrO <sub>2</sub> catalyst exhibited sharp peaks for metallic Ir which is known to be less stable than IrO <sub>2</sub> .
---

---

### Reviewer E: Rounds 1 and 2

Not openly accessible under our <a href="#">Publishing peer review reports</a> policy.
--