

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_116851
Title of the Manuscript:	CORROSION INHIBITION PERFORMANCE OF BRACHYSTEGLIA EURYCOMA LEAF EXTRACT ON MILD STEEL IN ACID MEDIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community. In this article, the CORROSION INHIBITION PERFORMANCE OF BRACHYSTEGLIA EURYCOMA LEAF EXTRACT ON MILD STEEL IN ACID MEDIA have been enhanced. These are the areas of greatest interest to today's scientists.</p> <p>Yes, the title is very appropriate for the article, as it covers the main points of the article.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive, and the most important results obtained in this study have been discussed.</p> <p>I note that the manuscript has been written in an organized manner in terms of sections, while respecting the scientific and methodological sequence of the properties studied, and I therefore consider the various sections of the manuscript to be entirely appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>I have checked all the references in the manuscript and confirm that they are correct.</p> <p>On the other hand, I note that these references are not convincingly recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality of the article's English is suitable for scientific communication.</p> <p>The article has been written in clear, sound language that can be understood by all disciplines.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Hanane Etabti
Department, University & Country	University Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Morocco