



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_50387
Title of the Manuscript:	Biocorrosion Inhibitory Potential of Aqueous Extract of Phyllanthus amarus against Acid Producing Bacteria
Type of the 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 Abstract- Leu was not defined.	Some sentences may not be required in the abstract to make it a real summary. Some highlighted. Abstract may require editorial corrections.	
Minor REVISION comments	Attend to Grammar and spelling errors, some noted.	
Optional/General comments	The methodology employed are in order, however, the use of Leucine should be incorporated in the methodology. Under biocorrosion analyses- treatment of specimen was not explicit. How was the treatment performed? Results: Functional groups are not indicated in Fig 1. Could be included. Only wave numbers were shown and should be stated as such in the legend. Figs 2 & 3-line graphs may be more explanatory. At 7 days of exposure, some of the results are not consistent with the statement made about addition of leucine. E.g 5mg + 20mgPAAE. I.E is about 46% as against 70% for 20mg PAAE at 20°C. CONCLUSION- Is it a possibility? Or it has been demonstrated!	Treatment methodology explained. The concentration incorporating Leucine has been added. Normally the analyser only gives the spectra with the wave number. Possibly the FTIR analyser is a different model. We reported the FTIR result as obtained from the laboratory. It is our opinion that fig 2 & 3 are best presented as bar charts. The chart has been altered to aid clarity. There was an error in reporting the result for 5mg + 20mgPAAE at 20°C. The error has been corrected. to fluctuations in temperature. It has been demonstrated.

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)	