

EXHIBIT 142



Building and Environment
HOME • LOGOUT • HELP • REGISTER • UPDATE MY INFORMATION • JOURNAL OVERVIEW
MAIN MENU • CONTACT US • SUBMIT A MANUSCRIPT • INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS • POLICIES

em Editorial Manager
Go to: -- Search Page --
Role: Publishing Editor Username: l.bandounas@elsevier.com

Search Submissions - Search Results
Article Title is containing 'Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation'

Page: 1 of 1 (1 total submissions)

Action	Manuscript Number	DOI	Author Name	Article Title	Article Type	Short Title	Keywords	Classification	Current Status	Status Date	Initial Date Submitted	Reviewers	Review Status	Handling Editor	Assigned Editors
View Submission View Reference Checking Results Similarity Check/Thenticate Report (7%) Duplicate Submission Check (12%) Details History File Inventory View Reviews and Comments Similar Articles in MEDLINE PubMed - Title Similar Articles in Scopus Scopus Corresponding Author S Publish Information Linked Submissions	BAE-D-20-03891R2		Brent Stephens	Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation	Original Research Paper		indoor air quality; air cleaner; ionizer; matter; volatile organic compounds;	HVAC&R equipment; Indoor environment - Accept; Laboratory Particle; Volatile organic; Indoor air quality	Completed	Feb 24 2021 8:54PM	Dec 17 2020 5:18PM	Ryan LeBouf Shun-cheng Lee Angus Shiu Ryan LeBouf Angus Shiu		Keerthana Manikandan	Bert Blocken, Civil Engineer, PhD, MSc

Reviewers		Top
No Reviewers have been assigned to this manuscript.		
Suggested Reviewers:	Jeffrey Siegel jeffrey.siegel@utoronto.ca	Top
	Shelly Miller Shelly.Miller@colorado.edu	
	Charles Weschler weschlch@rwjms.rutgers.edu	
	Richard Shaughnessy, The University of Tulsa rjstulsau@aol.com	
Alternate Reviewers		Top

View Reviews and Comments for Manuscript

BAE-D-20-03891

"Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"
Revision 2

Click the recommendation term to view the comments for the submission.

[Attachments \(2\)](#) [View Manuscript Rating Card](#) [View Review Question Responses](#)

	Revision 2	Revision 1	Original Submission
Angus Shiue (Reviewer 1)	(None)	Major Revision	Major Revision
Shun-cheng Lee (Reviewer 2)	(None)	(None)	Reject
Ryan LeBouf (Reviewer 3)	(None)	Accept	Minor Revision
Bert Blocken, Civil Engineer, PhD, MSc (Editor)	Accept	Re-revise (minor)	Revise
Author Decision Letter	Accept	Re-revise (minor)	Revise
Brent Stephens, Ph.D. (Author)			

BAF-D-20-03891

"Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"
Original Submission

Angus Shlue (Reviewer 1)

Reviewer Recommendation Terms:
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:
Rate Review:

Major Revision

55

0

Custom Review Question(s):

The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.
The paper is an original contribution to the field.
The paper provides a significant and lasting contribution to the literature.
The information presented was new.
The title of the paper reflected sufficiently and clearly the topic.
The abstract contained a sufficient summary of the work.
The introduction was relevant to the topic and has clear objectives.
The research method was solid and proven.
The results were clearly presented with sufficient analysis.
The conclusions were supported by the data.
The references were adequate and appropriate.
The English is satisfactory.

Response

4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
3 - Neutral

Manuscript Rating Question(s):

Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts.
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/highlights.

Scale	Rating
[1-3]	2
[1-3]	2

Comments to Editor:

For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

4 Succeeds by a small amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Comments to Author:

Transfer Authorization

If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your identifying information?
If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your review?

Response

No
No

Attachments:

Action	Description	File Name	Size	Last Modified
Download		Comments.docx	13.6 KB	Jan 04 2021 04:30AM
Download Sanitized Copy				

More Reviewer Details

Comments (Reviewer 1: Angus Shiue) Major revision-original submission

1. Effects of air mixing in the chamber on the performance of the ionization device should be investigated.
2. An analysis of the horizontal and vertical distribution of ions was conducted to better understand the ion diffusion process in ionization device operation.
3. The US Association of Home Appliances Manufacturers (AHAM) has set a voluntary standard for testing home air cleaners' performance in particulate removal. The clean-air delivery rate (CADR) of all the contaminants should be monitored.
4. Ambient VOC and ozone concentrations measured in the middle of the chamber during normal daily activity and the VOC and ozone levels increased when measured in front of the ionization device during still conditions.
5. Ozone is the major by-product of ionization device. The mechanisms suggest that the ozone generation rate can be affected by both product design and operating conditions. Product design factors that influence ozone generation. Operating conditions that influence ozone generation/ concentration include relative humidity, temperature, contaminations, and the airflow rate. The reported ozone generation rates from ionization device range from below the detection limit to up to certain value. Standardized ozone generation testing is needed to ensure that they do not cause indoor ozone concentration to exceed the health guidelines.
6. The relative effectiveness of the available technologies tested and the effect of product configuration and VOC properties on the VOC removal efficiencies are analyzed.
7. The adsorption and desorption of ozone on the wall of test chamber and the deposition of ozone resulted from the surface reaction can influence the evaluation results.
8. The removal of NO₂ and VOC might be resulted from the adsorption on the ionization device and the decomposition by the ionization that generated ozone.
9. The experimental data should be fitted well with the mass balance model proposed which yielded the adsorption, desorption and deposition rate constants of ozone.

BAE-D-20-03891

"Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"
Original Submission

Shun-cheng Lee (Reviewer 2)

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Reject
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	50
Rate Review:	0
Custom Review Question(s):	Response
The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.	2 - Fails by a small amount
The paper is an original contribution to the field.	3 - Neutral
The paper provides a significant and lasting contribution to the literature.	2 - Fails by a small amount
The information presented was new.	1 - Fails by a large amount
The title of the paper reflected sufficiently and clearly the topic.	4 - Succeeds by a small amount
The abstract contained a sufficient summary of the work.	3 - Neutral
The introduction was relevant to the topic and has clear objectives.	2 - Fails by a small amount
The research method was solid and proven.	3 - Neutral
The results were clearly presented with sufficient analysis.	3 - Neutral
The conclusions were supported by the data.	4 - Succeeds by a small amount
The references were adequate and appropriate.	2 - Fails by a small amount
The English is satisfactory.	1 - Fails by a large amount
Manuscript Rating Question(s):	Scale Rating
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts .	[1-3] 3
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/highlights .	[1-3] 2
Comments to Editor:	
For each question, please use the following scale to answer:	
1 Fails by a large amount	
2 Fails by a small amount	
3 Neutral	
4 Succeeds by a small amount	
5 Succeeds by a large amount	
Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.	
Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.	
Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.	
Comments to Author:	
Transfer Authorization	Response
If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your identifying information?	No
If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your review?	No
More Reviewer Details	

BAE-D-20-03891

"Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"
Original Submission

Ryan LeBouf (Reviewer 3)

Reviewer Recommendation Term:

Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:

Rate Review:

Minor Revision

85

0

Custom Review Question(s):

The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.

The paper is an original contribution to the field.

The paper provides a significant and lasting contribution to the literature.

The information presented was new.

The title of the paper reflected sufficiently and clearly the topic.

The abstract contained a sufficient summary of the work.

The introduction was relevant to the topic and has clear objectives.

The research method was solid and proven.

The results were clearly presented with sufficient analysis.

The conclusions were supported by the data.

The references were adequate and appropriate.

The English is satisfactory.

Response

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

5 - Succeeds by a large amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

4 - Succeeds by a small amount

Manuscript Rating Question(s):

Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts.

Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/highlights.

Scale Rating

[1-3] N/A

[1-3] 1

Comments to Editors:

For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

- 1 Fails by a large amount
- 2 Fails by a small amount
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Succeeds by a small amount
- 5 Succeeds by a large amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Comments to Authors:

General comments

This paper describes the effect of a bipolar ionization device on gas/particles/byproduct formation in a laboratory and field setting. I recommend publication after revision.

Specific comments

Report the manufacturer city and state the first time they appear. Report the SUMMA canister size, coating, and manufacturer, presumably 6L and electropolished or fused-silica lined. The use of fused-silica coating can reduce losses in future experiments.

Was the ppbRae (line 182) calibrated daily with isobutylene? A span calibration should be done daily with zero air and a known concentration of isobutylene. Results should be reported as isobutylene equivalents.

Avoid the term "about" and use "approximately", see line 259.

Line 264, if the summa valve was opened then it filled within <1 minute so keeping the valve open for 30 minutes does not collect a "30 minute sample".

Numbers less than 10 should be spelled out; see for example lines 274-279.

The fact that the summa and DMPH-tubes were analyzed by a commercial lab should first be presented at line 233-240 instead of at line 277. The discussion of lab analysis in the middle of the timeline takes away from the presentation of the timeline.

The a in TO-11A is both capitalized and not capitalized. Please use capital A throughout.

Define PTFE at first use.

Line 293, Pump flow rate should be average of pre- and post-flow rate. Was this done? Could say "average" here and make sure pre- post-flow rate is mentioned in above section of the method.

Line 287, In lab experiments 0.01 um used instead of 10 nm. Change to 0.01 um for consistency.

Line 390, Spell out TD-GC-MS at first use.

Line 409, define 295.

Table 2 and lines 581-591. Quality factors below 75 are very skeptical. Some use 90%. You should be very skeptical about everything except for x-pinene. Consider not reporting semi-quantitative data or ionizer performance assessments based on TIC analysis.

Line 641-642, The discussion of the results in relation to other studies should be reserved for the discussion section.

Line 771, Elevated indoor concentrations compared to downstream are most likely from indoor sources. Especially hand sanitizers and other alcohol-based products. Replace "levels" with "concentrations" in this line and figure 10 y-axis.

1st paragraph of discussion: Consider adding a leading paragraph to the discussion before diving into the details of ionization and VOCs. The leading paragraph should be an opening to the discussion telling the reader what the study presented and how these results compared to other studies. Some of this was done in the results section and could be moved to the discussion.

Last paragraph of discussion: Instead of ending with the limitations consider ending with a concluding paragraph that wraps up the findings into key takeaways.

Line 1083, The external standard calibration appears to be using an internal standard normalized area and so is not an external standard calibration. It is an internal standard calibration. What is the difference between the external and internal calibrations. This part is confusing.

Transfer Authorization

If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your identifying information?

If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your review?

Response

Yes

Yes

Manuscript BAE-D-20-03891

"Evaluating a commercially available In-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"
Original Submission

Bert Blocken, Civil Engineer, PhD, MSc (Editor)

Date Submitted:	Dec 17 2020 05:18PM
Status Date:	Feb 24 2021 08:54PM
Current Status:	Completed - Accept
Final Disposition:	Accepted
Editor's Recommendation:	Accept
Overall Editor Manuscript Rating (1-100):	10 (Select 1-100) View Manuscript Rating Card
Assignment Date:	Dec 18 2020 08:21AM
Accepted / Declined:	Accepted
Date Assignment Completed:	Jan 17 2021 03:38PM
Elapsed Days:	30

Editor's Comments to Editor

Reviewer: Angus Shue: For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

4 Succeeds by a small amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Reviewer: Shun-cheng Lee: For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

- 1 Fails by a large amount
- 2 Fails by a small amount
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Succeeds by a small amount
- 5 Succeeds by a large amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Reviewer: Ryan LaBouff: For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

- 1 Fails by a large amount
- 2 Fails by a small amount
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Succeeds by a small amount
- 5 Succeeds by a large amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Editor's Comments to Author

Reviewer #3: General comments

This paper describes the effect of a bipolar ionization device on gas/particulate/byproduct formation in a laboratory and field setting. I recommend publication after revision.

Specific comments

Report the manufacturer city and state the first time they appear. Report the SLM/MA coeluter size, coating, and manufacturer, presumably 6L and electropolished or fused-silica lined. The use of fused-silica coating can reduce losses in future experiments.

Use the pothas (line 183) calibrated daily with isobutylene. A span calibration should be done daily with zero air and a known concentration of isobutylene. Results should be reported as isobutylene equivalents.

Avoid the term "about" and use "approximately", see line 259.

Line 264, if the summa valve was opened then it filled within <1 minute so leaving the valve open for 30 minutes does not collect a "30 minute sample".

Numbers less than 10 should be spelled out, see for example lines 274-275.

The fact that the summa and DRPH-tubes were analyzed by a commercial lab should first be presented at line 233-240 instead of at line 277. The discussion of lab analysis in the middle of the timeline takes away from the presentation of the timeline.

The a in TD-LIA is both capitalized and not capitalized. Please use capital A throughout.

Define STPE at first use.

Line 233, Pump flow rate should be average of pre- and post-flow rate. Was this done? Could say "average" here and make sure pre- post-flow rate is mentioned in above section of the method.

Line 387, In lab experiments 0.51 um used instead of 10 nm. Change to 0.01 um for consistency.

Line 386, Spell out TD-QC-418 at first use.

Line 409 define STPE.

Table2 and lines581-591: Quality factors below 75 are very skeptical. Some use 90%. You should be very skeptical about everything except for ap-riene. Consider not reporting semi-quantitative data or ionizer performance assessments based on TIC analysis.

Line 641-642: The discussion of the results in relation to other studies should be reserved for the discussion section.

Line 771: Elevated indoor concentrations compared to downstream are most likely from indoor sources. Especially hand sanitizers and other alcohol-based products. Replace "levels" with "concentrations" in this line and figure 10 y-axis.

1st paragraph of discussion: Consider adding a leading paragraph to the discussion before diving into the details of ionization and VOCs. The leading paragraph should be an opening to the discussion telling the reader what the study presented and how these results compared to other studies. Some of this was done in the results section and could be moved to the discussion.

Last paragraph of discussion: instead of ending with the limitations consider ending with a concluding paragraph that wraps up the findings into key takeaways.

Line 1063: The external standard calibration appears to be using an internal standard normalized area and so is not an external standard calibration. It is an internal standard calibration. What is the difference between the external and internal calibrations. This part is confusing.

[Cancel](#) [Save and Close](#)



BAE-D-20-03891R1

"Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"

Revision 1

Angus Shiue (Reviewer 1)

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Major Revision			
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	70			
Rate Review:	0			
Custom Review Question(s):	Response			
The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The paper is an original contribution to the field.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The paper provides a significant and lasting contribution to the literature.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The information presented was new.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The title of the paper reflected sufficiently and clearly the topic.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The abstract contained a sufficient summary of the work.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The introduction was relevant to the topic and has clear objectives.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The research method was solid and proven.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The conclusions were supported by the data.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The references were adequate and appropriate.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The English is satisfactory.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
The results were clearly presented with sufficient analysis.	2 - Fails by a small amount			
Manuscript Rating Question(s):	Scale Rating			
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts .	[1-3] 2			
Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/highlights .	[1-3] 2			
Comments to Editor:				
For each question, please use the following scale to answer:				
1 Fails by a large amount				
2 Fails by a small amount				
3 Neutral				
4 Succeeds by a small amount				
5 Succeeds by a large amount				
Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.				
Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.				
Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.				
Comments to Author:				
Transfer Authorization	Response			
If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your identifying information?	No			
If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your review?	No			
Attachments:				
Action	Description	File Name	Size	Last Modified
Download		Recommendations.docx	12.2 KB	Feb 13 2021 02:27AM
Download Sanitized Copy				

Recommends (reviewer 1-Angus Shiue) _
major revision of R1

1. Effects of air mixing in the chamber on the performance of the ionization device should be done at this submission, it easily setup the simple device to perform.
2. An analysis of the horizontal and vertical distribution of ions was conducted to better understand the ion diffusion process in ionization device operation, it easily setup the simple device to measure.
3. Ozone is the major by-product of ionization device. The experimental data should be assumed and explained well with the mass balance model proposed which yielded the adsorption, desorption and deposition rate constants of ozone.

Cancel Save and Close

BAE-D-20-03891R1

Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"
Revision 1

Ryan LeBouf (Reviewer 3)

Reviewer Recommendation Term:

Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:

Rate Review:

Accept

85

0

Custom Review Question(s):

The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.
The paper is an original contribution to the field.
The paper provides a significant and lasting contribution to the literature.
The information presented was new.
The title of the paper reflected sufficiently and clearly the topic.
The abstract contained a sufficient summary of the work.
The introduction was relevant to the topic and has clear objectives.
The research method was solid and proven.
The results were clearly presented with sufficient analysis.
The conclusions were supported by the data.
The references were adequate and appropriate.
The English is satisfactory.

Response

4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
4 - Succeeds by a small amount
5 - Succeeds by a large amount
5 - Succeeds by a large amount
5 - Succeeds by a large amount

Manuscript Rating Question(s):

Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Graphical Abstract is a meaningful and an accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/graphicalabstracts.

Please rate on a scale of 1-3 whether the Highlights are a meaningful and accurate representation of the article. 1 = Meaningful; 2 = Not Meaningful; 3 = Not Provided. For more information, see www.elsevier.com/highlights.

Scale Rating

[1-3] N/A

[1-3] 1

Comments to Editor:

For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

1 Falls by a large amount
2 Falls by a small amount
3 Neutral
4 Succeeds by a small amount
5 Succeeds by a large amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Comments to Author:

Thank you for your consideration of the comments. Revisions are acceptable.

Transfer Authorization

If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your identifying information?

If this submission is transferred to another publication, do we have your consent to include your review?

Response

No

Yes

More Reviewer Details

Cancel Save and Close



Cancel Save and Close

Manuscript BAE-D-20-03891R1

"Evaluating a commercially available in-duct bipolar ionization device for pollutant removal and potential byproduct formation"

Revision 1

Bert Blocken, Civil Engineer, PhD, MSc (Editor)

Date Submitted:	Dec 17 2020 05:18PM
Status Date:	Feb 24 2021 08:54PM
Current Status:	Completed - Accept
Final Disposition:	Accepted
Editor's Recommendation:	Re-revise (minor)
Overall Editor Manuscript Rating (1-100):	0 (Select 1-100) View Manuscript Rating Card
Assignment Date:	Feb 01 2021 05:04AM
Accepted / Declined:	Accepted
Date Assignment Completed:	Feb 13 2021 05:38AM
Elapsed Days:	12

Editor's Comments to Editor

Reviewer: Angus Shiu: For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

- 1 Fails by a large amount
- 2 Fails by a small amount
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Succeeds by a small amount
- 5 Succeeds by a large amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Reviewer: Ryan LeBouf: For each question, please use the following scale to answer:

- 1 Fails by a large amount
- 2 Fails by a small amount
- 3 Neutral
- 4 Succeeds by a small amount
- 5 Succeeds by a large amount

Please provide more detailed comments to the author(s) in the "Reviewer Blind Comments to Author" field. Please ensure your grades above were reflected in your comments.

Please note that your recommendation and reviewer report are expected to cover the Highlights and Graphical Abstract if submitted with the manuscript.

Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article.

Editor's Comments to Author

Reviewer #1: see attachment

Reviewer #3: Thank you for your consideration of the comments. Revisions are acceptable.