



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IRJPAC_37402 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | COMPUTATIONAL CHEMISTRY STUDIES ON THE ADSORPTION/CORROSION INHIBITIVE POTENTIAL OF 2-(2-heptadecyl-4,5-dihydro-1H-imidazol-1-yl) ethan-1-ol) ON IRON SURFACE AT DIFFERENT TEMPERATURES |
| 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 | | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>The results of my review are:</p> <p>Line 29: adsorption of (on) the metal surface</p> <p>Line 47: Shift (Schiff) bases</p> <p>Line 48-53: It's a very long and difficult sentence to understand. And there are too many "at". It should be revised.</p> <p>Line 131-133: The Sentences must be revised.</p> <p>Line 171-174: The Sentences must be revised.</p> <p>Line 174: HDDH show (shows)</p> <p>Line 180: in Fig. 2; Table 1; After the table or fig, the points must be removed throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Line 209: has (have)</p> <p>Line 210,249, 256 and 295 shows (show)</p> <p>Line 219: involves (involve)</p> <p>Line 222, 314 and 316: is (are)</p> <p>Line 236: was (were)</p> <p>Line 255-256: the sentences must be checked as meaning" the smaller the ΔE value is, the greater is the reactivity of a molecule".</p> <p>I would recommend to the authors that the whole manuscript should be re-checked as grammar.</p> <p>As a result, the manuscript can be considered for publication.. But if more molecules were studied in this study, it would be possible to compare the properties of the molecules among themselves. So the results would be more meaningful.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|--|
| Name: | Kürşat Efil |
| Department, University & Country | Department of Chemistry, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Türkiye |

