



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1-We can't depend on methods used by the authors and make a conclusion because data might be fabricated. Without electrochemical measurements, how did you know the type of corrosion inhibition offered by the leaf extract (Anodic, cathodic or mixed type), what is the value of charge transfer resistance of the material? In fact, there is no chemistry in weight loss experiment. Therefore, there is a need for electrochemical studies (Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy data, electrochemical measurement, potentiodynamic polarisation) in order to validate the obtained results. 2- Of course we can use physical chemistry principles and theories, however, not all experiment can hold true due to the limitations of those principles and theories. I strongly rejected the statement made in line 236 without surface morphology (SEM and FE-SEM) study, before and after.	1. "<i>In fact, there is no chemistry in weight loss experiment</i>"?! What about hydrogen evolution and thermometric methods? The reviewer should be aware that, in spite of the sophistication of other methods, it is only weight loss method (that is alleged to be useless) that can be used to determine the mils per year (mpy) penetration of a corroding material. The charge transfer resistance of a material is a parameter used in calculating the inhibition efficiency by EIS. It cannot even be used to calculate the corrosion rate, i_{corr} nor E_{corr}. Why then the undue emphasis on charge transfer resistance as if it is the parameter of parameters? The data obtained in this work are reliable and can be defended anywhere. 2. Line 236 has been deleted. Done.