



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJPR_10499
Title of the Manuscript:	MORPHOLOGY, FUNCTIONAL AND PASTING PROPERTIES OF GINGER STARCHES PREPARED BY FOUR DIFFERENT DRYING METHODS
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	<p>This paper reports the results of “MORPHOLOGY, FUNCTIONAL AND PASTING PROPERTIES OF GINGER STARCHES PREPARED BY FOUR DIFFERENT DRYING METHODS”. It has been noticed that the work is valuable and makes use of the cheap means for development of the geo-polymer adhesives. Therefore, this paper is recommended for publication after making the necessary corrections and improvements suggested below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ABSTRACT should be short and concise. It should not have the subheadings. I think, the abstract will be complete if the authors merge the AIMS and RESULTS into a single paragraph. Kindly, remove the Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology and Conclusions. Rest of the information will be sufficient 	<p>The instruction in the authors guide was followed in writing the abstract. Please kindly refer to the authors instruction in the journal website which states the various headings the abstract should contain.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>for a good abstract.</p> <p>2. The relevant literature is not properly cited in the main text. Some claims have been made without references. For reference, consider the following paper:</p> <p>M. Y. Naz, S. A. Sulaiman, B. Ariwahjoedi and K. Z. Ku Shaari, <i>Characterization of Modified Tapioca Starch Solutions and Their Sprays for High Temperature Coating Applications</i>. The Scientific World Journal, 2014. 2014: p. Article ID 375206, 10 pages.</p> <p>3. Grammatical and spellings mistakes are often and should be removed after reading the paper carefully.</p> <p>4. I think the authors who have contributed in this research would have been listed in authors list, therefore, the section 'AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION' soon after conclusions should be removed.</p>	<p>All the relevant literatures have been properly cited. Please refer to the manuscript</p> <p>The grammatical and spelling mistakes have been removed. Please refer to the highlighted text in yellow colour(line 46 etc)</p> <p>Please kindly refer to the authors guide/instruction in preparing the manuscript. It contains a section titled "authors contribution " immediately after the conclusion</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		