

Answer to Reviewer's Comments for the revised manuscript:

Doped Tin Dioxide (d-SnO₂) and its nanostructures: Review of the theoretical aspects, photocatalytic and biomedical applications

Alexandre H. Pinto^{1*}, Andre E. Nogueira², Cleocir J. Dalmaschio³, Iago Nunes Frigini³, Jéssica Cristina de Almeida^{4,5}, Mateus M. Ferrer⁶, Olivia M. Berengue⁷, Rosana Alves Gonçalves⁸, Vagner R. de Mendonça^{4,9}

We are glad for the feedback received by the Editor and Reviewer's in this round of revision. We addressed all the comments and incorporated the suggestions whenever we considered them appropriate. This document presents our answer to the comments. The questions are in black and the answers in blue. Thank you so much for the time spent reviewing this manuscript.

Answer to Reviewer 2 Comments:

1. At the end of abstract, a general conclusion for the work should be given for making paper more scientific. It is suggested that the abstract should be polished or re-edited to highlight the classification logic of the summary topic, so that readers can understand this article more quickly.

Answer to Reviewer's Comment:

The abstract was rewritten following the suggestion of Reviewer's 2 to be more specific to the content of the manuscript.

2. Some papers are useful for support and explanation, such as Chem Eng J 443 (2022) 136341, J Electrochem Soc, 2020,167:020550, Electrochim Acta, 2018, 265: 577.

Answer to Reviewer's Comment:

We have read all the three papers suggested by the Reviewer. They were useful for understanding some visual aspects, such as figure disposition and writing styles. However, none of them was intimately related to topic of the manuscript. So, they were not cited in the revised manuscript.

3. The manuscript should be clearer about the classification logic of the summarized topic, and merely summarized the structural characteristics and applications of SnO may not meet the publication requirements of this journal.

Answer to Reviewer's Comment:

We respect the Reviewer's opinion, but we believe that the manuscript complies with the requirements presented in the guide to the authors page of the journal. Although it is not intended to be a critical review, the manuscript presents not only the recent advances on each area, but also

the underlying concepts related to each application presented. We truly believe it goes beyond and simple data compilation.

4. As for the aesthetics of some figures in the manuscript, such as Figure 9, when combined and re-edited, letter numbers on each small figure should be appropriately small, so that the overall look is better.

Answer to Reviewer's Comment:

Figure 9 from the previous version, which became figure 8 had the fonts resized. Although it is important to understand that we can not reduce so much the font size, since the font size chosen should be able to cover the information present in the original figure.

5. Now that the structure characteristics and application of SnO₂ have been summarized in the manuscript, the authors should have some understanding of the bottleneck of the current research direction. And the conclusion of the paper should provide some tentative answers and forward-looking predictions to these questions this could brighten the manuscript.

Answer to Reviewer's Comment:

We appreciate this comment from the Reviewer. In that regard, we included a new section to the revised manuscript called Further Applications and Future Challenges. In this new section, we present some additional applications related to SnO₂-based materials. These additional applications point to areas where the SnO₂ is still poorly explored, and some initial studies have shown the potential of these materials to succeed in these poorly explored areas.

6. The figures in the manuscript are only placed in a single figure, such as Fig. 1-Fig. 8. From the point of view of rich content, it is difficult to give readers a comprehensive summary feeling. It is suggested to refer to the figure combination of high-level review articles. If the figures in the cited manuscript can be flexibly combined, the level of the article will be improved obviously.

Answer to Reviewer's Comment:

We appreciate this comment from the Reviewer. However, we decided to not change the figures disposition and presentation. For most of them, the main reason is that presenting figures in a shared panel could lead to a loss of the clarity in the information. For instance, making the font size smaller and maybe not fully readable. For instance, Figures 1 and 5 could become ineligible if they had to be combined with other figures in a panel.

Another reason why decided to not combine some figures is because we believe that they are enough as presented according to the proximity to the information they are related to.

In summary, for most of the figures, we kept them as they initially were.