



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_PSIJ_10528
Title of the Manuscript:	CORROSION INHIBITION AND PITTING CORROSION OF SOME AUSTENITIC STAINLESS STEEL SAMPLES IN 2.5 M NaCl SOLUTION BY 3- AMINO-1,2,4-TRIAZOLE
Type of the Article	Original research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	I recommend that the topic be changed to "INHIBITION OF PITTING CORROSION OF SOME AUSTENITIC STAINLESS STEEL SAMPLES IN 2.5 M NaCl SOLUTION BY 3- AMINO-1,2,4- TRIAZOLE	We did
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Line 1 should be - "The effect of 3- AMINO-1,2,4- TRIAZOLE-----. Introduction: Line 13-14 should be- "The use of inhibitor is one of the most practical methods for protection of metals against corrosion but few compounds have been applied successfully. Line 18-19 should be- Compounds containing hetero-atoms such as sulphur, nitrogen and oxygen are very efficient in corrosion inhibition of metals. The author failed to mention how the inhibitor (ATA) was obtained. Was it purchased? From where? Was it synthesized? How? Results and discussion: The author did not indicate (figs 1b-3b) in page 3 in his Tafel plots. In page 4 – he used (b) instead of fig.1b; In page 5 – he used (b) instead of Fig.2b; and In page 6 – he used (b) instead of fig.3b. In page 10, the author did not give the standard range of activation energy values for physical adsorption mechanism. This is necessary to prove that your values fall within the range so as to confirm that that your inhibitor (ATA) is physically adsorbed on the metal samples. The reference (25) in page 11 is not reflected in your reference list (page 16). What is the standard values or range of values for	- All of these corrections were made and highlighted in the text. - Reference 25 was removed. - We added a paragraph including the standard values or range of values for ΔG°_{ads} for physical and chemical adsorption mechanism in page 11. - We r-wrote the conclusion in a condensed form and we added a sentence referring to the ΔG°_{ads}



SDI Review Form 1.6

	ΔG°_{ads} for physical adsorption mechanism? It has to be stated to prove your value fall within the range. Conclusion: Do not use bullet points for your conclusion. Rather condense your conclusion. E.g “ From the analysis of the results it was concluded that ATA is a good inhibitor.....” It is necessary to include in your conclusion that the values obtained for activation energy and ΔG°_{ads} Confirmed that ATA is physically adsorbed on your metal samples.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I recommend the editor to accept this paper for publication after minor revision and correction of the above mentioned comments. Thanks.	