

# Review of: "[Commentary] Comments on: “A perspective on impedance matching and resonance absorption mechanism for electromagnetic wave absorbing” by Hou et al. [Carbon 222 (2024) 118935]"

Mojtaba Joodaki<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. I agree with the comments mentioned in this article, and through the correct use of transmission line theory, everything can be explained very well. The only small point is that one should keep in mind that  $S_{11}$  is generally not equal to the reflection coefficient. The reflection coefficient is equal to  $S_{11}$  only when the load impedance on port 2 (output impedance) is 50 ohms.
2. I do not support the claim that 90% of journal articles are false. This may be true to some extent for the non-peer-reviewed publications, but still, 90% is more of an exaggeration than a scientific statement. According to Nobel laureate Honjo Tasuku, 90% of the views published by top magazines like CNS are wrong. As I said before, I see this sentence as an exaggerated formulation to alert young researchers that they should not blindly follow superstition.