SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOPS_32021**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Adsorption and Inhibition Effect of Eremomastax polysperma Leaf Extract on Aluminium Corrosion in Acidic Medium**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Paper**

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	**Lines 15-23:** The description given within this space could not have been novel to the extent that the author(s) did not reference the section. References are needed for completeness within lines 15-23. **Lines 47-48**: At what ratio of plant powder to solvent was the extraction carried out? Or could any amount serve? Maceration for phytochemical extraction is normally carried out with occasional shaking and/or stirring. Why did the author(s) ignore this? Why was the maceration allowed to run for as long as 7 days in a batch system? Is the decay of the plant material not possible over such length of time? **Lines 101-103:** What is the explanation for this observation? **Fig.1:** The line on the x-axis should be mage legible. **Page 133-135:** Give a molecular explanation to what happened. It is no longer not just enough to say 'what happened', but also 'molecularly why it happened'. **Page 135:** "that" in that line should be replaced with "than" **Lines 149-150:** ". . . Ea for the leaf extract were higher than the Ea value of the blank" What is responsible for this? How will this affect the corrosion of the metal?	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	Fig. 3: The labelling on the axes in this figure is not legible and should be improved upon. **Lines 164-165: "**The positive values of $\Delta S°_{ads}$ in the presence of the leaf extract indicate an increase in the disorderliness of the extract on aluminium surface". Positive values of $\Delta S°_{ads}$ is known to be the principal force for the adsorption of the inhibitor onto metal surfaces. Authors to reconcile the statement in lines 164-165 with practical reality. **Fig. 4:** The labelling on the axes in this figure is not legible and should be improved upon. **Conclusion:** " . . . leaf extract **could be** a **relatively** good inhibitor . . ." since the inhibition efficiency obtained was less than 85%.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The Adsorption and Inhibition Effect of *Eremomastax polysperma* Leaf Extract on Aluminium Corrosion in Acidic Medium was studied by the authors following to a large extent standard methods. Kinetic studies were not conducted/reported. Also, electrodynamic and electrochemical impedance spectroscopy analyses were not reported by the authors.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Ejikeme P.M.***
Department, University & Country	***Pure and Industrial Chemistry, University of Nigeria, Nigeria***