



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_30753
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF COATINGS FOR ASTM A106B LOW ALLOY STEEL
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	General comment: The PAPER is much more like a lab report or a testing report. It concerned on the performance of coatings for ASTM A106B low alloy steel. Different coatings based on paint group and electroless Ni-P groups were tested and analyzed. The authors did a lot of experiments, and an amount of works. However, the format of the paper is chaotic and there are too many minor errors. In addition, the authors should carefully check the manuscript and avoid the clerical errors. For example, the format of Table 1 and Table 2 should be same. Subfigure is missed in Figure 14, etc. I would recommend a minor revision on the side of results presentation. Specific comments 1) Please announce the research purpose of the paper work. And which part of work is novel. 2) In section 3, the experiments were fully presented without a proper analysis and discussion. Effective conclusions need to be given. In addition, too many bar figures are used which may be replaced by dot pattern.	The observations made by the reviewer are rectified. Research Purpose To identify the influence of electroless nickel phosphorus coating with different nano additives against corrosion. Novelty of work Investigation of nano additives and a prove using experimental work to confirm the performance of nano additives at various level. For section 3 it is done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. EN-P may be revised as Electroless Ni-P. 2. Make sure the Table 1 is correct. 3. The order of the table in the paper is confused. 4. Table 1 and 2 in Section 2 can be revised to reduce the size. 5. Proper nouns should be consistent. For instance, EN-P or En-P? AL2O3 or Al2O3? 6. The figures are extremely non-standard, which should be revised according to journal template and requirement.	Corrected Figure formatting will be done by the publisher as per there format as written in the instructions.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		