



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Title could be 'Effect of drying methods on the morphological, functional and pasting properties of ginger starch'</p> <p>Line 65 yam slurry. Are you working on yam?</p> <p>Line 256 discuss your work before comparing to other products. When you talk of significant difference, this $p < 0.05$ must appear Other comments are done in the manuscript.</p>	<p>The title as presented fully captured the aim of the research. The manuscript focussed on the morphological, functional and pasting properties of ginger starch in addition to the effect of the four drying methods.</p> <p>Yam has been replaced with ginger. Refer to the highlighted text in yellow</p> <p>Other comments have been accommodated. Refer to the highlighted text</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research work is okay with minor corrections	