



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1984
Title of the Manuscript:	Pyrolysis of household plastic wastes

General guideline: Reviewers are requested to follow these guidelines during review: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)*
- Results & discussion *(Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)*
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- This form has total 10 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
<u>COMPULSORY REVISION</u> comments	Since many studies have been done for plastic wastes, the authors should add more discussions of the existing problems and their innovations at the end of the "Introduce Section".	The comments of the reviewer is certainly helpful accordingly we did the following: a. Rewrote and changed introduction b. As we studied further the published materials we referenced those of major authors.
	They investigated pyrolysis behaviours of different plastic wastes, the comparisons between them from their compositions (element content, Molecular structure) to pyrolysis products should be added in the paper.	We did, we add to decomposition reactions
	In Fig. 5(TG figure) , clear food wrapping plastics and Wal-Mart gray plastic shopping bag have much more differences than other feedstocks, can they give some reasonable explanations?	Removed the clear food wrapping The difference in thermal stability of shopping bag and other wastes were explained based on their original constituents.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The schematic figure of the experimental system can be added into the 2.2.3 section of the paper in order to make their descriptions more clear.	It is added
	The liquid, gas and residue yields of the six types of plastic wastes should be shown in a table.	Table was inserted to the end



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional</u> comments	Did they collect gas in the experiments, if they did, please add them and make a comparison of different plastic wastes.	Sorry we did not collect gases due to technical unviability.
---------------------------------	--	--