



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12277
Title of the Manuscript:	Thermogravimetric and Kinetic of thermal degradation of Powdered Laboratory Examination Gloves: 1. Analysis of thermal Scan Traces from 310-440°C.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The manuscript, (MN: 2014_BJAST_12277) should be controlling and rewriting, because there are very writing errors (for example: Line 11, line 12, line 20 and so...). 2. The formula of neoprene polymer is wrong write (in line 166, but is written correctly in line 83). 3. The thermo gravimetric lines have 10 samples not 11 in Fig.3. 4. There are some temperature values in Tab1 less than 300 °C, but I don't seeing these values on graphs. 5. The formula of A value (in line 272 or Eq.6) is wrong. Because the derivative in this Equation is by time not temperature in end step. 6. In the Ea Eq. (In line 324) the 0.00740t³ value is not seeing in Figure8.	Done 2. Thank you. Line 83 is about monomer and line 166 is for polymer. So it is correct. 3. Thank you, we corrected Fig 3. 4. The top ax is temperature begging from 78°C and higher 5. Added justification in the text 6. The E_q as in the Fig8 where x =t, corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issues -Yes. Because the degradation materials are medical waste so it is a hazardous material.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		