



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13716
Title of the Manuscript:	Thermogravimetric and Kinetic of thermal degradation of Powdered Laboratory Examination Gloves: 2. Analysis of isotherm and thermal scan Traces from 307-450°C.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- The manuscript is part of a work that was divided into two parts (or more) for publication. Thus, in parts of this work there are data that do not match. For instance, PMMA and PET are in the list of abbreviations, but not in the text. Is it necessary that PP, PE and PS appear in the list of abbreviations if there is only a sentence for them with their names and corresponding abbreviations? Also, the techniques described in Materials, Instrumentation and Methods part must be revised. - The manuscript is very long and the authors need to justify the real need to insert data obtained from the TGA technique for so many temperatures, if the same authors write that the TGA alone is not able to provide a complete information about the phenomena. - I suggest to summarize the work. - The quality of all Figures must be improved, specially Figure 6. - In Materials and Methods (line 67), authors wrote that "twelve samples were analyzed..." In Figure 1 only eleven samples (for eleven temperatures) were shown. In line 276 is written "Table 4 ... for eleven samples.." but in Table 4 only ten samples were shown. In lines 114-116 is written "Figure 2 represents ...for	Thank you for Help, We took care of it We cut many sections of it and summarize the other sections. The full scanned was added to Fig 2. Now there are 12 samples there Sample 455 was added



SDI Review Form 1.6

	11 samples of PLEG". In Figure 2 there is 12 graphics which one for a different temperature range. But it can lead to misinterpretation. Each graphic is related to one sample? - How many times was the same scan performed? Are the data obtained reproducible? - For good writing, the name of the samples should be standardized. it is written "Sample 310" or "PLEG 310" or "PLEG 310 sample" for the same sample. - In Conclusion and remarks it is not possible to present new data of the authors and worse by other authors. The Conclusion part must show the completion of the work presented. Thus, the degradation mechanisms of PLEG cannot be written in this part. - The numbering of references must be revised (1-11 and after 21-22) (?) There references in the text – line 245 "Kruse et al [42] ..." that is not in the references (?).	We removed the extra graph Some of them 3 or 4 times. The data were well reproducible. The suggestion was taken well, thank you! Thank you! We valued the comment We worked on it Thanks, we revised and corrected properly.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	None	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	None	