



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_46346
Title of the Manuscript:	Electrochemical Corrosion Inhibition Process, Adsorption Mechanism and Mechanical Effect of Newbouldia laevis Leaf Extract on Aluminum Alloy in Acidic Environment
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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper as it stands now does not adequately describe adequately how the testing was conducted. <b>One could not, reading this text, repeat the work.</b> We don't know how the corrosion inhibitor was prepared. We don't know the solvent, how the inhibitor extract was prepared for use. The test material (if it was 5052 Aluminium) is not adequately described. For instance, what is its (at least) nominal composition, does it have cold work, what is its hardness? The test corrosion solution is not clearly, and not in the methods section, described. Was it 0.1, 0.5 or 1.0 M HCl (in water?)</p> <p>The authors should look to the paper Corrosion Inhibition of Mild Steel in 0.1M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> Solution by Anacardium occidentale Gum</p> <p>David E. Arthur<sup>1*</sup>, Adebisi Adedayo<sup>1</sup>, Gerald Igelige<sup>1</sup> and Edwin Ogwuche<sup>1</sup></p> <p>To see how their Material and Methods section could be improved.</p> <p>For many (most) of the corrosion tests the test temperature is not mentioned. This can have quite an influence in corrosion.</p> <p>Fig 2 and 3 seem to present the same data, just visualized differently. Maybe you don't need both?</p> <p>I don't see where you refer to Fig 7 &amp; 8. What are they for and why does 8 have an axis unit of money?</p> <p>I looked up "OPTICAL emission microscopy". The authors don't seem to be using this technique.</p> <p>On the hardness measurements, while you don't give any statistics to show scatter, how do you know the inhibitor changed the hardness, and not the corrosion process?</p> <p>Sections of the text seem to be plagiarized from other sources. These areas need to be re-written.</p> <p>The researcher did tests and got results which should be valuable. The tests seem to have been done with care. The results with properly documented procedures should be documented for others, which I hope they will.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	There are minor English grammar issues to resolve.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This manuscript seems to be written by two, or more, people. Merging their writing style would be a plus.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i>Joseph Tylczak</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>United States of America</i>