

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 (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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, as this manuscript have studied the reduction of microbial contamination of Chechin nchabe (cooked fermented cassava) produced in Noun (west Cameroon) by a second fermentation. This second fermentation of <i>Chechim nchabe</i> could be a solution to improving the sanitary quality of this product during production. Yes, its suitable</p> <p>Yes, its comprehensive. No, these needs updates in formatting and writings. Consult relevant papers for writing these sections.</p> <p>Yes, its scientifically, correct.</p> <p>References needs improvement in spellings of journal names and authors name formatting. Consult formatting template.</p> <p>"Results and discussions" write heading of results as you have mentioned discussions separately. Results should be written in past instead of present. Figure 4 should be added in material and methods. Figure 4.6, all sections needs alphabet numberings and should be mentioned in caption. 55</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, it needs improvement, some sections should be written in past.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tehreema Iftikhar
Department, University & Country	Government College University, Pakistan