



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Recommend specific changes in the writing. -The abstract does not provide enough information regarding the results of the experimental work, and the paper is poorly written, the language is a major problem which may be got corrected from some native English speaker -The details of production paste method is not clear, e.g. which species used is not known, water and oil absorption capacity is detailed, e.g. which rpm is used when centrifuging. Better heading and more detailed description the methodology section would be helpful. "Laboratory analyses" does not reflex accurate heading. The experimental designs and replications were not well described. -The chemical composition of paste samples are not given, - The number of sample is inadequate. -This manuscript cannot be acceptable with this format it needs some major revisions. -And also it can be short communication not be original	Corrected Corrected The paper was just checking the pasting and functional properties of the two legumes. The chemical composition of the samples was published already.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	article. -The literature cited is good but I think that this paper needs to be rewritten and commented in the right manner	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think that this paper needs to be rewritten	Every necessary correction had been done.