



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11663
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF THE PASTING AND FUNCTIONAL PROPERTIES OF COWPEA (<i>VIGNA UNGUICULATA</i>) AND SOYBEAN (<i>GLYCINE MAX</i>) BLENDS
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 (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. In the abstract (methodology) the author (s) did not mentioned any methods except samples preparations. 2. In the introduction the general information should come first then the specific ones. 3. In sample preparation after blending of the samples, is there a drying process? If yes what are the conditions for this process? If not what about the effect of water content on the determination of the different functional properties? 4. The method for statistical analysis was not mentioned 5. In the results and discussion author (s) have to present the results first then come the Table in the suitable place 6. In the results of the wettability the author (s) explained the increase of this parameter due the high water absorption of soybean, and this is not true, as their results of water absorption showed that increasing the percentage of soybean decreasing the water absorption. Please explain. 7. In Table 2 why there is no SD and statistical	Corrected Corrected Explained Corrected Corrected Corrected and explained Corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	analysis? 8. There is no recommendation in the conclusion either in the abstract or in the final conclusion.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Abstract the results of the functional properties should come first then the results of the pasting properties. 2. The author (s) have to follow the journal style (e.g. the P value) 3. All Latin names should be in italics 4. Check the highlighted words in the MS 5. In Table 1 there should be consistency in using the decimal point	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		