



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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	I could only read first 5 pages of the manuscript as it was difficult to go further. The manuscript is poorly written. I think there is problem with formatting so the words are properly spaced. The reference to figure is equally confusing. Some simple things which could have been said in one line have been unnecessarily expanded. The presentation of the manuscript is very poor. I could only read first 5 pages of the manuscript as it was difficult to go further. I think there is problem with formatting also as the words are not properly spaced. The reference to figure is equally confusing e.g. the authors have in manuscript figure 1 (a), (b) and (c) but from there description it is not clear they are referring to which figure among them. Some simple things which could have been said in one line have been unnecessarily expanded e.g. for equation (3) it would have been simply mentioned that it being a straight line equation the slope gives order of reaction (n) and intercept the rate constant (k). Authors need not write time and again all eleven samples were run.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In view of these observations I would recommend that the authors go through the whole manuscript once more carefully and resubmit.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Y. K. Bhardwaj
Department, University & Country	Radiation Technology Development Section, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Trombay, Mumbai, India