Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOCS_124427**
Title of the Manuscript:	**2-(4-fluorobenzyl) chromeno [2,3-c] pyrozol-3(2H)-one as copper corrosion inhibitor in HNO3 : gravimetric and quantum chemical investigation methods**
Type of the Article	**Research**

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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.	**The research is based on the innovative idea of using organic compounds to inhibit the corrosion of copper.Studies done on the mechanism of inhibition using the methodology of DFTand gravimetry revealed that chemisorption occurs on the surface of copper. A coat that protects the metal. Theoretical and experimental studies compared and conclude to say that the metal is protected at 1M concentration of Nitric acid. Reveals the work done satisfactorily**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes ,tithe us suitable**	
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.	**Abstract is precise but to be corrected as the word inhibition is missing soon after copper corrision Parameters data be mentioned for Best results obtained**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes, appropriate ,provided be cross checked before publication**	
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.	**Technical papers need experimental and theoretical concepts matched.Samevus followed in this work. Conclusions are always based on the results obtained by both methods. Hence I suggest the work is technically n scientifically robust and sound**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**References are to the mark. If extension of work planned need to add more**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Language is good.Minor corrections be checked . Molecular structure image is incomplete . Abbrevations be written completely in a seperate list as s.t was found missing in the very first formula	
Optional/General comments No more comments		

Review Form 3

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:	**Shrikrishna H Gurlhosur**
Department, University & Country	**Visvesvaraya Technological University, India**