

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124003
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATING CORROSION PROTECTION CAPACITY OF SELECTED OIL PAINTS TO REINFORCING STEEL BAR IN CONCRETE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides important insights into the corrosion protection capacity of locally available oil paints for reinforcing steel bars in concrete, which is critical for improving the durability of concrete structures. The focus on using cost-effective and locally produced materials, such as Leyland oil paints from Ghana, adds practical significance, especially for regions with limited access to more expensive corrosion inhibitors. The research is methodologically sound, with detailed electrochemical analyses that contribute to the understanding of corrosion protection mechanisms. Overall, the study offers useful findings for engineers and researchers interested in enhancing infrastructure longevity in economically constrained regions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I think the current title, "Evaluating Corrosion Protection Capacity of Selected Oil Paints to Reinforcing Steel Bar in Concrete," is suitable as it accurately reflects the study's focus on corrosion protection and the materials involved. However, it can be made more concise and clearer. My suggestion for an alternative title:</p> <p>"Assessment of Oil Paints for Corrosion Protection of Reinforcing Steel Bars in Concrete"</p> <p>This title maintains clarity while shortening the original without losing any meaning.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract gives a summary of the study, covering the problem (corrosion of steel in concrete), the method used (applying oil paints), and the main results. However, it can be made clearer and more structured. Here are my suggestions:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make the Objective Clear: The purpose of the study should be stated more clearly right at the beginning. 2. Include Specific Results: The results mentioned are a bit vague. It would be better to focus on the key findings, like how the different coatings affected corrosion rates. 3. Simplify Technical Terms: The abstract uses technical terms like "stable polarization" and "Tafel slope" that might be too complex for an abstract. It would be better to simplify these terms for easier understanding. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow with standard sections like the Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion, which are well-organized.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically correct because it uses common methods to study how well oil paints protect steel from corrosion. The experiments are clearly explained, making it easy to understand and repeat the process. The results match the conclusions, showing that the research was done properly.</p> <p>In summary the research in this paper is OK and solid, but there are many grammatical mistakes throughout the text that make it harder to understand in some places. Also, many of the figures are not centered or properly aligned, which affects the overall appearance and flow of the paper. Correcting these grammar issues and placing the figures neatly in the center would improve the readability and make the paper look more organized and professional. This would help readers focus better on the research and its findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are enough, with a good mix of sources that are relevant to the topic of corrosion protection and the use of coatings for reinforcing steel bars in concrete. It also cover important studies about corrosion protection and the materials used. They give a strong background for the research. However, many of the sources are quite old, which means they might not show the newest discoveries or improvements in this field. To make the paper stronger and more complete, it would be helpful to add more recent references that reflect the latest advancements.</p> <p>Including newer studies from the last 5-10 years would improve the paper and make it more relevant to current research. These recent studies could offer updated information on corrosion resistance, new materials, and improved techniques. This would not only make the manuscript more valuable for readers but also show that the authors have considered the most current knowledge in their field. Adding these up-to-date sources would make the research more trustworthy and applicable to modern engineering practices.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Add more recent studies: There has been a lot of progress in corrosion protection techniques and materials in the past few years. Including more recent research from the last 5-10 years would strengthen the paper.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in the article needs some improvement for it to be suitable for academic writing. There are quite a few grammar mistakes, awkward sentences, and missing punctuation that make the text harder to read. To fix this, the paper should be carefully edited to correct these issues, so it becomes clearer and easier to understand, meeting the standards for academic publications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall, this research is important because it explores how locally available paints can protect steel in concrete, which is useful for construction projects. However, the paper needs some improvements. There are grammar mistakes, the layout isn't consistent, and the figures need to be properly centered. The font and numbering in some parts are also different, which makes the paper look uneven. Adding more recent references would also help make the research more up-to-date. Fixing these issues would make the paper easier to read and look more professional.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Shahir Ahmad Safi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Engineering and Technology, Pakistan</p>