



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_12505
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of <i>Sterculia setigera</i> Bark Extract on the Flammability of Flexible Polyurethane Foam
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	The manuscript entitled "The Effect of Sterculia setigera Bark Extract on the Flammability of Flexible Polyurethane Foam" refers to the current issues of reduction of polyurethane foam flammability, too. The presented results are very valuable and important but there is a problem with the way of the writing the manuscript. The manuscript contains the same sentences as the manuscript with the number 2014_ACSj_12506. Please compare the following lines from manuscript 2014_ACSj_12505 and 2014_ACSj_12506: 132-136 and 171-175, 135-147 and 181-189, 150-156 and 191-198, 160-172 and 200-212, 177-181 and 216-220, 186-193 and 223-231. I can understand that Experimental parts are almost identical but the result discussion should be somewhat different. The explanations refer to the same problems or phenomena, however they should be written at least, in another words. Because of the manuscript is written in the same way as 2014_ACSj_12506 may comments are the same: 1. The compounds, responsible for the flammability reduction should be identified and the elemental analysis of the obtained foams should be made, in order to indicate the reason of the flammability reduction of the foams. 2. What is the extraction yield of the plant bark? 3. Were the tests of the foam flammability made in accordance with the defined standards? If yes, they should be cited. 4. I think that the description of the plant Sterculia	1 The elemental analysis was not done because it is a part of my Msc. Thesis and GC-MS was done on only <i>Acacia senagal</i> leaf extract. We also feel that the flammability characteristic of the extract can be ascertained even without the elemental analysis. Furthermore for it to be used as a flame retardant other parameters will have to be considered before its final selection ,so our research is a preliminary one in the search for the alternative 2 The extraction yield was not determined for the reasons explained above 3 We cannot find the standard according to which the methodology and the analysis were done but the literature cited were obtained from various journals both national and international of repute as indicated in the literature. The search for the standard took us this long and we cannot still find one although the methods are similar to some international standards like ASTM D3659-86,ASTM F501-88,ARTICLE 11,NFPA 701 FIELD TEST,METHOD 5902 FTMS191A etc but despite the statements above we still feel the methodology is reliable in determining the parameters, that is, the burning



SDI Review Form 1.6

	setigera, in Introduction, is too detailed. 5. Similarly, in Experimental part, the part - The sample collection and identification is too long. 6. What kind of polyol was used to the foam production? More details, describing the polyol, should be given.	characteristics of the obtained foams 4 Corrected as shown in the text 5 Corrected as shown in the text 6 The type of Polyol and other details were given
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		