

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_85937
Title of the Manuscript:	THE STUDY AND PREDICTION OF CORROSION RATE OF DUCTILE IRON IN CASSAVA FLUID USING JAVA ORIENTED PROGRAM
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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	No apply.	
Minor REVISION comments	No apply.	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is an interesting proposal related with a real problem such as oxidation in the Industry accompanied with a potential solution to predict the status of corrosion development. However, please consider the following observations and suggestions to improve the manuscript: i) In the Abstract, it should be added some phrase to justify the need of this study and approach contribution with this system proposed. Properties of the materials involucrated and targeted objective of this study. In this context some information as it was mentioned in the introduction should be mentioned. ii) Please Consider to add a Scheme of the system in study to clarify the spatial distribution and set up to record data. In this aspect revise the material and method section too, to add more details related. iii) In material and method section; in the subsection "2.2.4 Application development"; please try add more details related. It is not clear as it is described. As well please revise the title of the subsection. iv) About the section of Results; It should be improved. It is too short and non-well developed with proper description. vi) Please check: in the "the curve of weight loss" was considered a control experiment?. vii) In the results section it should be added further description of results discussing and explaining each step. vi) The Results section and discussion it should be revised. Revise the manuscript and Resubmit it.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Bracamonte
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba (UNC), Argentine