

Technische Universität Chemnitz 09107 Chemnitz  
Maria Skyllas-Kazacos AM GLETr  
Guest Editor Batteries  
School of Chemical Engineering  
UNSW Australia  
Sydney, 2052  
Australia

Telefon: +49 371 531-31509  
Fax: +49 371 531-21269  
E-Mail: rudolf.holze@chemie.tu-chemnitz.de  
Internet: www.tu-chemnitz.de/chemie/elchem

Ort, Datum: Chemnitz, 07.12.2018

*Re: batteries-04-00047-v4*

Dear Prof. Skyllas-Kazacos,

after a confusing, winding, time-consuming and mostly highly irritating publication process our submission has finally been published. Some details of this process merit attention, and presumably they should also be known to other scientists possibly considering a submission to this journal and this editorial team.

After submission two reports of reviewers and a comment of the (managing?) editor were provided. One reviewer asked for more pictures and a table of contents, the other missed two publications. Apparently he/she had overlooked that publications up to a clearly specified deadline were included. Both wishes could be fulfilled, the new deadline caused a further literature search and inclusion of a few more reports. The editors report was rather strange. It suggested, that 40 % of the manuscript were copied - whatever that meant. In a winding and confusing explanation by the technical editor it remained open whether this implied that 40 % of the text was plagiarized or something else (Please note that we did duplicate check for your manuscript and the similarity rate is 40%). A publishers policy considering agreement of 12 words as an unacceptable repetition was invoked, change of language was suggested as a remedy. Closer inspection of the huge file supplied as "proof" revealed, that the most frequently mentioned item was a book chapter by myself on this topic. Perhaps repeating own text is not welcome, it certainly constitutes no plagiarism. Second most frequent was your website: I had provided on request an abstract and the first page of our contribution, it was posted on your website, and this particular expert considered this an unwelcome (or whatever) copy. Very frequent was the running title of the manuscript. And because in references the titles of a quoted publication were requested a huge number of hits was generated. There is no need to comment further on this convincing demonstration of complete incompetence. I changed some of my own text and considered the case closed. Quickly thereafter I was informed about acceptance of our submission.

Somewhat surprisingly a message of the guest editor arrived telling me that acceptance of our submission might happen only after significant changes. In a slightly winding text the guest editor complained about the bad habit of authors forgetting to quote important publications. We basically agree. But it turned out rapidly that all "missing" quotations were to publications by the guest editor. And it turned out also that most were already present in the manuscript. The guest editor simply failed to see them. Sometimes because she even could not get bibliographic data of her own publications right. For details see below.

At this point we started to suspect that we either faced a particular case of vanity or an attempt to built herself a memorial with the unwitting help of invited authors. Both cases are very strange, perhaps clinical. We certainly do not want to be part of it. We made sure that all even very distantly relevant publications by the guest editor were mentioned to get this by now embarrassing project closed. We got another annotated file. This time the guest editor messed around with the

inserted endnotes, apparently without knowing how to do this. To get everything right costs us many hours. We will never again submit anything to Batteries or any other of your journals. And depending on your response we will also make this experience very public.

Kind regards



---

overcharge effects on carbon felts in VRB were first reported in:

"Overcharge in the Vanadium Redox Battery and Changes in Electrical Resistances and Surface Functionality of Graphite-Felt Electrodes", F. Mohammadi, P. Timbrell, S. Zhong, C. Padeste and M. Skyllas-Kazacos, *J. Power Sources*, 52, 61-68 (1994).

you have omitted the following work:

"The importance of wetting in carbon paper electrodes for vanadium redox reactions", Marc-Antoni Goulet, Erik Kjeang and Maria Skyllas-Kazacos, *CARBON*, (2016) 10, 390–398

wrong volumne, correct: 101

and

ref. 318: Effects of surface pretreatment of glassy carbon on the electrochemical behavior of V(IV)/V(V) redox couple reaction, by L. Cao, M.Skyllas-Kazacos and D.Wang, *J. Electrochem. Soc.* 163 (7) A1164-A1174 (2016).

This work also needs to be discussed

ref. 177: Thermal and chemical activation of the felt in the VRB was first reported in:

"Modification of Graphite Electrode Materials for Vanadium Redox Flow Cell Applications - Thermal Treatment", B.T. Sun and M. Skyllas-Kazacos, *Electrochimica Acta*, 37, 1253-1269 (1992).

wrong page range, correct: 1253-1260

and

ref. 330: "Chemical Modification of Graphite Electrode Materials for Vanadium Redox Flow Battery Application - Part II: Acid Treatments", B.T. Sun and M. Skyllas-Kazacos, *Electrochimica Acta*, 37, 2459-65 (1992).

These original papers should be acknowledged and discussed.

Rayon and PAN-based felts were first studied and reported for the VRB by:

ref. 182: "Physical Chemical and Electrochemical Properties Comparison for Rayon and PAN based Graphite Felt Electrodes", S. Zhong, C. Padeste, M. Kazacos and M. Skyllas-Kazacos, *J. Power Sources*, 45, 29-41 (1993).

again, this original paper has been overlooked.

ref. 468: "Chemical Modification and Electrochemical Behaviour of Graphite Fibre in Acidic Vanadium Solutions", B.T. Sun and M. Skyllas-Kazacos, *Electrochem. Acta.*, 36, 513-517 (1991).

ref. 335: "Superior electrocatalytic activity of robust carbon felt electrode with oxygen-rich phosphate groups for all-vanadium redox flow battery", Kim, Ki Jae; Lee, Heon Seong; Kim, Jeonghun; Park, Min-Sik; Kim, Jung Ho; Kim, Young-Jun; Skyllas-Kazacos, Maria, *ChemSusChem* (2016), 9, 1-11. DOI: 10.1002/cssc.201600106

wrong page range, correct: 1329-1338

Cao L;Skyllas-Kazacos M;Wang DW, 2017, 'Modification Based on MoO<sub>3</sub> as Electrocatalysts for High Power Density Vanadium Redox Flow Batteries', *ChemElectroChem*, vol. 4, pp. 1836 - 1839, 2017.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/celec.201700376>

should be included in discussion

this was first proposed in:

"All-vanadium redox battery with additives", M. Skyllas-Kazacos, Patent Appl. No. PCT/AU88/00472, Dec. 1988.

these mechanisms were first suggested by Sun and Skyllas-Kazacos in 1992. This needs to be stated.

ref. 177: first reported by Sun and Skyllas-Kazacos, but wrong at the proposed location where airless treatment is discussed

ref 177: improved wettability first reported by Sun and Skyllas-Kazacos in 1992

improved kinetics with In and Mn was first reported by:

"Chemical Modification and Electrochemical Behaviour of Graphite Fibre in Acidic Vanadium Solutions", B.T. Sun and M. Skyllas-Kazacos, *Electrochem. Acta.*, 36, 513-517 (1991).

this report is on indium-impregnation, not on addition of In(III) to the solution

this was first reported and patented by Skyllas-Kazacos et al:

"Stabilised Electrolyte Solutions, Methods of Preparation Thereof and Redox Cells and Batteries Containing Stabilised Electrolyte Solutions" M.Skyllas-Kazacos, Prov. Patent Application No PN2747, May, 1995, Australian Patent No 696452, Dec 1998.