

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_102754
Title of the Manuscript:	Inhibition of alkaline corrosion of mild Steel using synthetic 2-(4-Methylphenylsulphonamido)-3-methylbutanoic acid.
Type of the Article	Research

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:

(<https://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Importance is somewhat limited. The actual inhibitor would most likely have a limited application, but the detailed methodology for doing the corrosion study is an important read.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the organization of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the corrosion study is extremely well-done, and I have full confidence in the investigation's results.</p> <p>6. The references are recent and reasonable for this study. I do suggest that a common format should be applied for the references. For example, reference titles vary from having all words in the title capitalized and having only the first word capitalized.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are some minor grammatical and punctuation mistakes. Also, millilitres is mL, not ml. Overall, the manuscript is very well written.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>One suggestion: since the anti-corrosion agent is an acid, and the media is aqueous KOH, the authors may wish to include that the molar amount of inhibitor insignificantly affects the concentration of the KOH solution, even with the highest concentrations of the inhibitor used (approx. 0.0005 moles inhibitor to 0.03 moles of KOH).</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kevin C Cannon
Department, University & Country	USA