

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_117126</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE INHIBITIVE ACTION OF Ocimum gratissimum LEAF EXTRACT ON MILD STEEL CORROSION USING THE ULTRA VIOLET LIGHT</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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the manuscript is important as it addresses a crucial aspect of corrosion science, offering insights into effective corrosion inhibitors, which is valuable for protecting metal structures.</b></p> <p>2. <b>The title effectively communicates the main focus of the study and is suitable.</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract provides a concise summary of the study's findings but could be more comprehensive with specific numerical results.</b></p> <p>4. <b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but some sections could benefit from further elaboration, especially the discussion.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Overall, the manuscript appears scientifically correct, although the discussion could be strengthened with deeper analysis.</b></p> <p>6. <b>The references are relevant, but additional recent references related to the inhibitive action of plant extracts on corrosion and UV radiation could enhance the literature review.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The writing is clear, coherent, and effectively communicates the research findings and methodology. There are no major grammatical or language issues that would impede understanding or detract from the scholarly value of the article.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the field of corrosion science by investigating the inhibitive action of Ocimum gratissimum leaf extract on mild steel corrosion under UV light. The research is well-structured and provides clear details on the methodology and results. However, there are areas for improvement, including enhancing the depth of the discussion by providing more extensive interpretation of the findings within the context of existing literature. Additionally, incorporating more recent references and addressing any potential limitations of the study would further strengthen the manuscript. With some revisions, the manuscript has the potential to make a significant impact in the scientific community.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adya Rizky Pradipta
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic of AKA Bogor, Indonesia