



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32841
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetics of Parboiled Paddy under Microwave Drying
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:

(<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	3. "30.81x10⁻¹⁰ m²/s" instead of "3.08x10⁻¹⁰ m²/s" 7. Needs a citation 9. Please delete this part. The study do not involve pulsed microwave or 900 W power level. 10. Please delete this part too. If authors just use continuous and pulsed microwave method for to find initial moisture content, please add a citation. 11. Please add the brand and model of digital balance. 12. Please add the picture of dryer. 18. Final moisture content is wrong according to Figure 1. Also, the moisture contents calculated as dry basis or wet basis. Please be sure. 20. What is the final moisture, there are many confusing various numbers such as 16.2% or 14.1%. Please be sure about dry basis or wet basis. 21. According to figure 1, it took around 68 minutes where authors wrote 45 min. There is a misexpression. 25. Are the minor numbers belong to models that do not shown in tables? Please explain them in text. 29. Figure and text are explain different results. 30. "30.81x10⁻¹⁰ m²/s" instead of "3.08x10⁻¹⁰ m²/s"	Done Done Done Done Done That is 14±1 % d.b corrected DONE 25The value of coefficient of determination (R²) varied from 0.96167 to 0.99953 for 1.5 cm, 0.99644 to 0.99949 for 3 cm, 0.99333 to 0.99852 for 4.5 cm and 0.99115 to 0.99939 for 6 cm thickness, whereas the chi-square were found to be varying from 5.37112x10⁻⁵ to



SDI Review Form 1.6

		0.00434 for 1.5 cm, 7.18739×10^{-5} to 5.0424×10^{-4} for 3 cm, 1.74379×10^{-4} to 9.24872×10^{-4} for 4.5 cm and 1.18684×10^{-4} to 0.00121 for 6 cm thickness.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. "Were" instead of "was" 2. "Were" instead of "was" 4. Citation do not meet journal standards 5. Citation do not meet journal standards 6. Citation do not meet journal standards 8. "(w.b.)" instead of "wb" 13. Citation do not meet journal standards 14. Give a number to formula 15. Give a number to formula 16. Rewrite all formula numbers again. 17. Citation do not meet journal standards 19. Citation do not meet journal standards 22. "Fig 2" instead of "Figs 2" 23. Citation do not meet journal standards 24. Misspelling, please control it. 26. Please delete "(" and add a "." Before writing "Same". 27. Citation do not meet journal standards 28. Citation do not meet journal standards 31. Please delete it, written two times. 32. Please delete it, written two times. 33. Please delete it, written two times.	DONE
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic of this manuscript falls within the scope of British Journal of Applied Science & Technology. The study is generally well expressed. However, there are many points that have to change. References do not meet journal standards, must be all checked again.	