



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_14847
Title of the Manuscript:	A review of Corrosion in Agricultural Industries
Type of the Article	Review 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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	9. the abstract is not detailed enough. Should include the design of the study, main points of the research methodology applied, etc. 205. under conditions of tensile stress and temperatures... (use either of <u>above</u> or <u>about</u> ...70 oC [2, 15]. It is.... 211. Major title should be changed into upper case letters 332 - 379. Remove bracket enclosing reference numbers in the listed references. Do same for all the references. i.e. 1. and not [1] 332 – 379. the last author's initial should go with a full stop rather than a coma. Do same for all references. E.g. Scerbejova <u>M.</u> Anti corrosion ...	The article is a review paper and not a research into the effects of various conditions stated in the article. Corrected. OK corrected Done Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	2. The topic is too open. It will have been narrowed down to “comparative study of the effects of various agricultural chemicals on agricultural facilities and equipment and possible control in ... (study area) or farm” as the case may be. The paper does not present the author's experimental findings to support the literatures cited so far. It is only based on earlier works by other authors hence, giving it a theoretical look all through. It is not evidence based.	This is not a comparative study . It is a review of the goings on in the agricultural sector with reference to corrosion activities. This a review paper AND NOT experimental studies on corrosion activities on farms.