



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_45234
Title of the Manuscript:	ADSORPTION AND CORROSION INHIBITION OF EPIPHYLLUM OXYPETALUM LEAF EXTRACT ON ALUMINUM ALLOY AA5052
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	1. Is the paper acceptable in its present form? My recommendation is that a MINOR REVISION to the manuscript is required before its publication. 2. Is it a new and original contribution? The research contributes to the literature of this theme 3. Does it contain material that might well be omitted? NO. 4. Does it give adequate references to related work? YES 5. Is it clearly presented and well organized? YES. 6. Is the English satisfactory? 7. NOT AT ALL. The English of all the manuscript should be controlled and the existing grammatical and stylistic errors should be corrected. Some suggestions in the revised version were added. 8. Are the illustrations and tables all necessary and adequate? The tables and figures are useful to the paper and helps in the discussion of the results. However, I would like further discussion with regard to the questions included in the revised version of the manuscript. 9. Is the summary adequate and informative? YES. 10. Are the conclusions sounds and justified? YES.	Thanks for the review. We sincerely welcome the reviewer's comment and had worked towards making the necessary correction. Legend Blue Colour: Added comments Red Colour : Corrected Comments and Green Colour: Untouched Comments suggested for consideration Note: The corrections on the reference list were not heightened. It has been made to fit into the journal standard. Request: We are highly pleased with the contributions the reviewer made to our paper. We wish to communicate with the reviewer. So we seek for research assistant as the review shows that he/she has deep knowledge of the subject area. Thank you.
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	