



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_49042
Title of the Manuscript:	Sewer water effect on the corrosion of caste iron before and after treatment
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Abstract must be rewritten. It seems to be authors given introduction contents. Abstract should briefly give the experimental details throughout the study.</p> <p>2. Introduction part is not sufficient. Authors instructed to add some more information (eg. Application of cast iron).</p> <p>3. In my point of view, weight loss alone could not be given complete details about corrosion phenomena.</p> <p>4. Authors instructed to draw adsorption isotherms using weight loss values.</p> <p>5. References are not uniformly given. Authors must rearrange the references given in uniformed manner. Must follow journal's format.</p> <p>6. It will be nice if the authors could add some more references.</p>	<p>1. the abstract part is rewritten again.</p> <p>2. I think that the introduction part concentrate well in the problem discussed in this manuscript.</p> <p>3. weight loss is considered as a real technique to evaluate the corrosion rate and I think it is sufficient.</p> <p>4. the isotherm parameters not in focus in this manuscript.</p> <p>5. the references part is modified.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	NA	
Optional/General comments	English must be improved a little	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>