



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	The concept is novel and worked experimentally. However if software's used were mentioned it would have been informative.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some mistakes such as abstract 5 th line " <u>firsta</u> sample was 12 thermal scanned from 50°C to 800°C with a heating rate of 10°C/min while it were purged with 10 mL/min" Should be avoided. The abstract should contain what is the idea and not the experimentation part as written in the abstract. The heading can read as kinetics rather than kinetic. The language and style should be checked. This study reports the results of non-catalytic conversion of examination gloves a neoprene based 104 materials	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A novel approach.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer