



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_41304
Title of the Manuscript:	CORROSION INHIBITION AND ADSORPTION CHARACTERISTICS OF MYRIANTHUS arboreus LEAVES EXTRACT ON COPPER IN SULPHURIC ACID SOLUTION.
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>)



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	<p>According to Table 6, many constituents are involved in the extract. So, how and why could the author(s) determine the molar concentration of the inhibitor solution?</p> <p>I. 104. The equation 2 cannot be understood.</p> <p>In Figure 1, every plot looks linear. It is difficult to believe that the plots start from zero.</p> <p>In §3.2 and Table 1. It is unclear which data (immersion time) were used.</p> <p>In §3.3. Lacking discussion for the reason of the decrease in the corrosion rate.</p> <p>The unit of the corrosion rate in Table 1 is different from definition. Please unify it.</p> <p>§3.4 may be deleted. Essentially no difference from §3.2.</p> <p>In Fig. 1, the weight loss shows the linear change. So, “log(W_i-ΔW)” plots in Fig. 5 cannot be linear.</p> <p>It is difficult to apply linear regression for Figs. 3, 5, 6 and 7.</p>	<p>The molar concentration was not determined, the extract was prepared in g/l as indicated in line 87. (Sorry, it was just an oversight).</p> $IE\% = \left(\frac{\Delta W_B - \Delta W_{inh}}{\Delta W_B} \right) 100$ <p>1.</p> <p>2. We don't expect the plots to start from zero because there always be weight loss in the presence of H₂SO₄ without the inhibitor.</p> <p>3. Increase in percentage inhibition efficiency lead to decrease in corrosion rate. This may be attributed to a change in adsorption type from physical to chemical as temperature is increased (Atkins 2006).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit of corrosion rate CR(gcm⁻²h⁻¹). • 3.4 is deleted • Linear plots in Fig 5 confirms a first order reaction type with respect to the corrosion of copper.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Is. 37, 41, 43, 47, 54, and 56. [ref #] verb → First author et al. verb</p> <p>I. 46. Abbreviation of “IE” must be defined at first appearance instead of the definition in I. 101.</p> <p>I. 76. The phrase “dried in acetone” does not make sense.</p> <p>I. 83. pulverized to using a blender → pulverized using a blender</p> <p>I. 92. 303–303K → 303–333 K</p>	All minor comments have been corrected.
Optional/General comments	There are problems in data analysis. Reviewer encourages the author(s) to revise the manuscript.	Authors have revised the manuscript thoroughly.