

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_98879
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetic and thermodynamic study on the pyrolysis of low density polyethylene in the production of polyethylene wax
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:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Contribution to knowledge is identified but the manuscript should improve by these following comment 1. Generally, the paper is lacked of recent paper citation and references. It would be great if citation of recent years (2018-2023) papers are referred. 2. Abstract – abstract is not comprehensive. It is lacked of objective, description of the finding and conclusion 3. The problem statement related to why wax is important compared to liquid product is not clearly presented in introduction. 4. The diagram of instruments or experimental set up of the pyrolysis process should be presented for better clarification. I also wonder how the mass of wax was determined during the pyrolysis. Typically, a Thermal Gravimetric Analyser (TGA) was used to determine the kinetic data of the pyrolysis. 5. Figures is not well illustrated. I suggest author to use better software like origin 6. Validation of the kinetic study can be done to ensure that the developed kinetics is reliable. 7. It will be great if the author may show the reproducibility rate ie how many repetition are done and what is its standard deviation of the data.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is ok. Understandable	
Optional/General comments	no	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ruzinah Isha
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia