

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_96909
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate composition of banana and pineapple wine fermented by Meyerozyma guilliermondii and Pichia guilliermondii
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.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper is useful because of the material (Banana and Pineapple) used and the introduction of <i>Meyerozyma guilliermondii</i> and <i>Pichia guilliermondii</i> in place of <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> commonly used for fermentation. This will also enhance the ongoing 'Waste to Wealth' program in Nigeria.</p> <p>Yes, It is.</p> <p>Yes but despite that, the author need to give us the acceptable nutritional component of an ideal wine before he/she can use the phrase '....acceptable nutritional composition...' for the strain. This refers to the last statement in the Abstract.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If minor corrections are taken care of. For instance, what is obtainable in plant is called fat. On the contrary, the author used 'Lipid' interchangeably with 'fat'. This can be found the second paragraph of the introduction while stating the nutritional contents of Pineapple fruit. Also, the author needs to state the basis on which <i>Meyerozyma guilliermondii</i> and <i>Pichia guilliermondi</i> is preferred to <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>. Is it that it a better strain or it is cost effective?</p> <p>It is also necessary to give the detail procedure of Ogodo <i>et a</i> (under sample collection) to enable the readers understand reason(s) for choosing 3:1 for pineapple and banana.</p> <p>It was stated that slight modification was made for fermentations of 'must'. What was the actual modification made and why?</p> <p>Take note of the sub heading 2.4 and its content. Did you actually extract lipid or fat? Note that what you have on your table of results is 'fat'.</p> <p>The last statement in the second paragraph of section 3.0 should be reviewed for the omission made.</p> <p>What insinuated the use of 'commercial fruit wine in Table 1? Is it recommended by any regulatory body like WHO, FAO or NAFDAC? Whichever the case may be, it is expected to be used as an extensive tool of comparism in your discussions.</p> <p>The moisture contents of your result should be highlighted along that of Chilaka <i>et al</i> and Aminu <i>et al</i>. in addition, try to be consistent with your references.</p> <p>The author should also be kind enough to explain the reason(s) or probable factor(s) which influenced the conformity of ash con tents to Chilaka <i>et al</i>/but contrary to Aminu <i>et al</i>.</p> <p>Paragraph 3 of section 4.0 talks about some fruits, what fruits? Mention them. What also make the fruit wine have '... desirable nutritive quality...'? Please, state your reasons.</p> <p>Line 4 of paragraph 4 under section 4.0 should be 'these' as against 'this' written.</p> <p>Please, state the factors responsible for the disparity in Carbohydrate values.</p> <p>The conclusion should clearly state the better strain since the experiment adopted two or better still recommend the two.</p> <p>The references are recent enough except the last one.</p> <p>The author should careful go through the write up and references for minor typographical errors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahmatallah Adenike Alawode
Department, University & Country	Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria