



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_20740
Title of the Manuscript:	Kineticsof Powder-Free Laboratory Examination Gloves at 323°C and 408°Cby Thermogravimetric Analysis
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:

(<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 Minor REVISION comments		The author wishes thank very much the reviewer who spend his/her time in this work and express these constructive comments.
	The paper is poorly written and is riddled with grammatical and typographical errors.	Done
	Abstract is poorly written and needs attention.	Done
	Authors have given a whole sentence in the keywords section	Done
	Introduction needs to be more suitably structured with a logical flow of information.	Done
	The referencing is poorly managed in that Lines 25-27 which lacks the science has [1,2,3,4,5] references.	Done
	There are referencing errors e.g. line 37	Corrected
	Fig 1 and written details thereof should be moved to the results section and not be part of the experimental section..	Done
	Information given in Line 124-135 should not be part of the results and discussion.	It must go somewhere. Would you, kindly suggest a place for them?
	The weight % in figure does begin at a 100% authors need to show proper % weight loss scales.	Done
	Are the details given in Line 113 a claim or is there any experimental proof ?	Experimentally proffed.
	The two sentences in Line 149-150 are contradictory.	Removed
	The sentence in line 158 is confusing and needs clarification.	Corrected
	Figure 2 is poorly labelled and poorly presented with labelling errors.	Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Figure 3 is also riddled with spelling errors.	Corrected
	Is there a need to present both figs 2 and 3?	Yes, and Corrected
	Line 262 is confusing.	Improved
	Fig 8 a is extremely poorly presented.	Improved
	Table 4 should not be split.	OK, improved.
	The conclusions needs major revision and rewriting.	Done
	Fig 10 needs attention.	Done
	Line 395 is not a conclusion	Removed
	Referencing needs attention	Improved
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper needs major revision	Thank you