



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_31945
Title of the Manuscript:	Solenostemon monostachyus Leaf Extract as Eco-friendly Inhibitor of Aluminium Corrosion in Acidic Medium
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors studied "Solenostemon monostachyus Leaf Extract as Eco-friendly Inhibitor of Aluminium Corrosion in Acidic Medium". However; 1. The conclusion reached by the authors is unreliable due to the absent of: -Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy data. -Electrochemical measurement -Potentiodynamic polarization 2. Line 236: on what basis the authors make such statement while there is no SEM image recorded? 3. What is the highest concentration at which constant percentage efficiency was observed? 4. The manuscript suffers from poor language construction, grammatical inconsistencies and flow of words. All Figures were of low quality.	1.The methods mentioned by the reviewer are some methods of corrosion testing. Other methods are also available. It doesn't mean that until particular methods are used before conclusions are valid. The conclusions obtained in this study are quite valid and reliable. 2.Although no SEM image was recorded, the statement is made based on physical chemistry principles and theories. 3.Within the range of extract concentration studied, constant percentage inhibition efficiency was not recorded in this work. It could have been achieved if higher extract concentrations were used. 4.The correctness and grammatical consistency of the manuscript speak for itself. Can the reviewer please point out just two of such alleged poorly constructed sentences and write their correct versions, so that we can learn from him/her? 4.The resolution of the figures has been improved upon. Done.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		