

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_94269
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSING THE EFFECT OF ACETYLATION ON SOME STRENGTH PROPERTIES OF DANTA (<i>Nesogordonia papaverifera</i>) AND ANANTA (<i>Cynometra Ananta</i>)
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:

(<https://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript proposed by the authors aimed on the chemical modification of wood with acetic anhydride to improve some mechanical properties. The paper is well written and the choice of lesser used tropical hardwoods as raw material was relevant. The results obtained agreed with previous studies and have positioned the studied wood species as candidates for futures use in construction or other fields without any risk of strength loss. However, some minor changes are necessary.</p> <p>1 Introduction</p> <p>The author wrote...polupropylene, I suggest them to put polypropylene</p> <p>2 Materiel and methods</p> <p>2.1 Wood source</p> <p>The authors would give the GPS data of the selected wood species (if they possess them) of Bia district. In what kind of forest (primary or secondary?) did the authors have sampled the trees?</p> <p>2.2. Wood sample preparation (correct the title as suggested here)</p> <p>How many samples of each test did the authors used? The authors should give the norm or the standard method used to dimension the wood blocks.</p> <p>Chemical modification of the sample. The authors used ethanol/toluene as solvent, but they write that solvent ratio was 4:1:1, I am afraid that this ratio should be reconsidered for it doesn't correspond the system proposed. I suggest the authors to write this solvent ratio as follow: 4:1</p> <p>The authors should take attention to the temperature used for wood drying. The conventional interval of temperature for wood drying doesn't excess 105°C. Can you give in case the norm that allows using 105±5°C?</p> <p>The authors said that they made a test control with water instead of acetic anhydride. What did they control (have you control the swelling of the wood blocks after that test control? Why they didn't used pyridine alone as solvent?</p> <p>Equation 1 must be put after the formula</p> <p>4. Conclusion The conclusion doesn't give the perspectives of the work. What can we expect for these lesser used wood species after the results obtained?</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Safou Tchiama Rodrigue
Department, University & Country	Universite Des Sciences Et Techniques De Masuku, Gabon

Review Form 1.6