

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_102018
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of bacterial isolates from cocoa almonds during fermentation in “saf’s” agroforestry system in the Amazon
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>ALL CHANGES MUST BE HIGHLIGHTED.</p> <p>Relatively, yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction can be shorten, especially general information on cocoa. • Figure 1 is unnecessary. • Figure 2 is unnecessary. • Why numbers of the samples were not equal? • Please provide Z formula for the sample size calculation. • All the materials and devices must be addressed with their manufacturers as well as countries of origin. • Figure 3 is unnecessary. • Figure 4 is missing! • All results of the phenotypic and genotypic identification of the isolates must be collected in a table for better understanding. • Did the authors annotate their sequences in genetic databanks (e.g. GenBank)? If yes, please clarify in the text. • In the phylogeny tree, what was the bootstrap number? • Did the authors edit the raw sequences and how? • Why did not the authors use further sequences from other studies in their phylogeny study to compare their own sequences with others? <p>A CRITICAL QUESTION: Why did the authors compare various bacterial genera in a phylogeny study?!! Results were obvious from the beginning and what were the major scientific gains/points? If the authors wanted to have a molecular epidemiology of the bacterial spread in the region; then, they should include a higher number of the sequences from the current study plus several sequences from other studies, preferably from close</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	geographical locations. Discussion is not appropriate based on the present problematic (questioned) tree!	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, the manuscript needs English revision.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramin Mazaheri Nezhad Fard
Department, University & Country	Iran