

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_99130
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effects of Power Input and Welding Speed on Corrosion Rate of Steel Welds in Acidic Medium
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Quite important as information on the development of science 2. It is recommended to be corrected, because there are similarities with other manuscript titles 3. there is a little improvement 4. It is recommended to follow the instructions or format for writing manuscripts in this journal, because there are sections that are not appropriate 5. Needs improvement, especially in the order in which reference citations are used 6. It is recommended that references be replaced with the latest to keep up with scientific developments The discussion needs to be improved by linking research methods, research results as shown in tables and figures. The discussion is suggested to be connected with the results of previous research to strengthen the statement Abstracts and conclusions are made to answer the research objectives, and convey the best results. In addition, research weaknesses need to be conveyed at the end of the conclusion. This is important as information to facilitate further researchers in conducting research	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	grammar needs improvement	
Optional/General comments	Follow the writing according to scientific rules	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nasruddin
Department, University & Country	Indonesia