



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PSIJ_28273</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>DFT Calculations of Mesembryanthemum nodiflorum compounds as Corrosion Inhibitors of Aluminum</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The work presented by the authors is based on theoretical (DFT) calculations. No experimental evidence is provided for any findings presented in the manuscript. Indeed, theoretical background is also needed to overcome some the unanswerable experimental findings. On this ground the manuscript is to be read and reviewed. My observation on the Manuscript-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As the authors have not isolated the species from the mixture it is likely that each and every functional group present in the molecule under consideration would likely to accelerate or inhibit the corrosion of Aluminum. In so what will be net effect and the interpretation of the theoretical calculation made?</li> <li>2. HOMO and LUMO values are with the negative sign (Table 1). How the authors could state HOMO is of higher value than LUMO and also how to expect the transfer of electron from HOMO to LUMO?</li> <li>3. Explanation/reason provided for the Data of Table 2 is not sufficient. It is difficult to understand why the calculations ( LUMO inh – HOMO Al (eV) LUMO Al – HOMO inh (eV)) are made and in what way it helps in stating that inhibitor is of anodic or cathodic</li> </ol>	<p><b>All voluble remarks have been done With Thanks</b></p> <p>It is impossible to study the net effect theoretically. We deal with single molecule and not the bulk.</p> <p>LUMO is higher value than HOMO and we substrate LUMO from HOMO to obtain the energy gap: LUMO-HOMO</p> <p>The explanation is giving at the beginning of page 4 "The chemical reactivity is a function ....." line 87.</p> <p>Also, the explanation for interaction is given in lines before table 2. Mesembrenone shows strong interactions in the case of anodic and cathodic type. HOMO and LUMO</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>type. What sort of inference can be drawn from LUMO inh – HOMO Al calculation? Method of evaluation of HOMO or LUMO is not available. Basis for the separation of different inhibitors into cathodic and anodic inhibitor is not available in the text. Can it be decided just by free energy value?</p> <p>4. Method of evaluation of all the parameters of Table 3 is not known and moreover they have not been defined. Value of <math>\Delta N</math> is too small and are almost equal (within the exptl.error?) to take any decision on the nature of bond present in the system (electrovalent or covalent), Electrophilicity value (<math>\omega</math>) is the highest in case of Mesembren. It means it is a good acceptor of electron. Then how does the conclusion - Mesembren is a good inhibitor -arises?</p> <p>5. Mesembrenone which has the lowest energy gap - Electron transfer is expected from HOMO of the species to LUMO of the metal. It is difficult to understand the authors decision that the largest inhibition efficiency is for the species Mesembrenone species?</p> <p>6. All adsorption processes are spontaneous with a negative sign to <math>\Delta G</math> . But on P.7 <math>\Delta G</math> is shown with a positive sign.</p> <p>7. P.6: Statement “Al atoms can accept electrons from inhibitor molecule to form a coordinated bond” (anodic inhibitor).How to support the statement?</p>	<p>for Al are obtained from Ref. 25.</p> <p>Mesembrenone shows strong interaction in the case of cathodic 4.38 eV and anodic 4.98 eV (Table2) as compared to other three compounds. Thus Mesembrenone is considered to be a good inhibitor.</p> <p>Electron transfer from HOMO of the metal to LUMO of Mesembrenone to give strong interaction 4.39 eV as cathodic inhibitor (Table2). Cathodic and anodic (Back donation).</p> <p>No, we did not say that. We said that all compounds show positive Gibbs free energy except Mesembrenone (page7).</p> <p>Table 2 shows clearly the strong interaction between the HOMO of the inhibitor and LUMO of Al and also the HOMO of Al and LUMO of inhibitor especially for Mesembrenone.</p> <p>Again see table 2 to compare the interactions</p>
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>8. P 6:Explanation /mode of action for donation and back-donation processes strengthen the adsorption of Mesembrenone onto the aluminum surface and increase the inhibition efficiency is required</p> <p>Authors have given some theoretical foundation for the experimentalists to probe further before and either to approve or disapprove the fact. Theoretical materials scientists will really appreciate the content. However, the manuscript can be considered for publication as a note in the journal only after getting satisfactory explanation for above queries.</p>	<p>between four compounds.</p>
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>		
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		