



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This study examined the effect of <i>Sterculia setigera</i> bark extract on the flammability of flexible polyurethane foam. The topic of the paper is relevant, however some parts of the paper need to be review (Abstract, Results & Discussion, and Conclusion) before it can take in consideration for publication. Comments were merged in the pdf manuscript file. However I remember authors to: - Rewrite the abstract - In the Introduction, I think that it will be good to state the species economic importance, notably with reference to study realised in Nigeria, Senegal and others African countries. I want to talk about its pulpwood and gum. - Review "Results" and "Discussion" : authors should merged them or rewrite clearly "Results" and "Discussion". The part state "Discussion" seem as "Results and Discussion". It is important. - Rewrite "Conclusion".	Abstract rewired The species economic importance was given Corrected Conclusion revisited
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I approve the revised manuscript. But I suggest according to the journal standards to consider this paper as short communication. There are minors modifications I have made in the manuscript, especially in CONCLUSION	
---	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wouyo Atakpama
Department, University & Country	Laboratory of Botany and Plant Ecology, Departement of Botany, University of Lomé, Togo