



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6375
Title of the Manuscript:	Waste Plastics: Pyrolysis of Powdered and Powder-Free Laboratory Examination Waste Gloves
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	Introduction - Poorly constructed and various subject matter in introduction. Keep it short, full of content and focus. - The summarising of the findings/conclusion of past research should not be a list of names/numbers, but rather than a brief discussion of facts or theories (ex: line 37,73, 77,81). Select the most relevant to the research been studied. - The problem statement was not stated clearly. - It should be a very short section which explain why the methodology used in the present study was chosen and why it will provide new insight. - The whole introduction should be restructured. Materials, Instrumentation and methods - This section is prone to be wordy or overly detailed - In my opinion, it would be useful to the reader if a flow chart of the overall methods is added in the text, following the explanation of each step in sequence.	Done Done Don Done Done Summarized
Minor REVISION comments	Results and discussion - Line 281 till 285 should be moved to method section - There are 9 of total 25 samples for TIC, however	You are right! However, the discussion will be more related to the experimental, therefore we keep it there.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the work only highlighted sample 1, sample 2, sample 4 and suddenly sample 15 and then sample E. It should be a section describes briefly why only those samples are selected in the discussion. 3. How about the solid samples section (Line 524)? It should be some explanation why this section is suddenly appeared in the discussion section.	It has been explained within the text, because of the similarity in composition, we limited ourselves to the more distinguished samples. Discussion has three sections: TGA, Liquid samples and solid samples.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic of this manuscript falls within the scope of British Journal of applied Science & Technology and significant. I am recommending publication of the paper after the changes have been made.	Thank you very much