

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_100479
Title of the Manuscript:	Reduction of microbial contamination of Chechin nchabe (cooked fermented cassava) produced in Noun (west Cameroon) by a second fermentation
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:

(<https://www.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>)

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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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>Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community, in the development of novel food products and shares an indigenous knowledge, and it try to solve the local food safety problem.</p> <p>Yes, the title is appropriately describes the work</p> <p>Yes, it touches all the section of manuscript. I rise my question in the manuscript</p> <p>Yes, all the sub sections are appropriate, however, subsection 3.1.2 is better to be in the method section</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct, however I suggest to write the discussion following the result for each subtopics (without subsection discussion)</p> <p>The references are almost recent, and sufficient. Since the manuscript focuses on traditional products it is expected difficult to obtain more references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Excellent language usage, except some future tense usage in the method section. I highlighted them in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are many types of fermented and cooked local products that are consumed widely. However, there is a susceptible for food safety issues due to unhygienic processing. Therefore, researches like this work should be done to solve the food safety issues.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tadlo Yitayew Atlog
Department, University & Country	Bahir Dar Institute of Technology, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia