



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. Although the introduction has been rewritten, it still fails to put forward the novelty and contribution of the paper to the field, where there are thousands of publications dealing with pyrolysis of plastic wastes.	Dear Reviewer, We appreciate your comments and concerns. Please consider the fact that we are not doing a review paper
2. Unfortunately the experimental procedure cannot be changed by rewriting the paper, so the fact that the experimental procedure is not scientifically sound, remains unsolved.	The research was centralized to find the simplest way to convert wastes to useful materials. The experimental procedures were designed based on the objective of research: to remove the plastic wastes Taboo!
3. Concerning the comment dealing with the oven temperature of the GC/MS analysis, the reasoning of the authors is quite questionable: collecting the products under 175 °C does not necessarily mean that the boiling points are lower than such temperature. Products with very high boiling points can be transported and collected at temperatures under their boiling points. As a matter of fact the temperature of the reactor is higher than 175 °C, so the evolved products may have boiling points higher than 175 °C	The reviewer comments is based on Rault's Law and is correct. However, a GC column also has its limitation. The column that we used has a max. temperature of 270°C. For protection of column, and the condensed temperature of the liquid materials, we decided not going higher than 220 °C. Some of the materials may left in the liners before getting to the column but this is the case of every GC experiment. Otherwise we never had to clean and replace the GC liners
4. The similarity of the results with those of other authors does not mean that the results are reproducible. Moreover the experimental procedure used by the authors is not equivalent in all their experiments.	No comment for an statement similar to : "sunshine is not the evidence of day time."
5. Concerning pyrolysis yields, the table added is not complete (solid yields of SDP and SPFB(fast heating) are missing). Additionally such table should be placed in the results and discussion section, never in the conclusions section.	The comment is good. Since the table summarises the results of all experiments, we added a summary section and moved the table to there. Also the missing data were added.
6. Although some paragraphs have been added to the "Results and Discussion" section, the interest, novelty or usefulness of the results is still not put forward. A proper comparison and discussion of the differences of the results with those of other authors is still lacking	WE HAD COMPARED OUR RESULTS WITH OTHER AUTHORS. The reviewer in the comment (4) mentioned that we had compared with the results of other researchers.
7. The conclusions do not contribute nothing new to the field, they are well known facts that have many times been reported in the literature.	The conclusion is a kind of mixture of "conclusion, remarks and summary. In some aspect we agree that some of the literature are not contributing to the Field as much as other researchers. However, a little contribution also is significant and occasionally life saver.