

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99822
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence of Free Fatty Acids (FFA) in cocoa beans with various main geographical origin of Côte d'Ivoire in the climate change context.
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Yes. The article was able to establish the fact that processing conditions can influence the Free Fatty acid (FFA) constituents of cocoa which would create awareness to Farmers on the best method to adopt during processing and storage.</p> <p>The title is suitable but the keywords were not entirely captured (check abstract).</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive but the author should follow recommended author guidelines.</p> <p>They are. However, the author should endeavor to treat all the result sub-headings separately under discussion segment. It is. Though, a clear (scientific) factor should be stated as to why the FFA contents of cocoa were optimum on day 7 with various treatment time?</p> <p>The references were sufficient. Nonetheless, the author is expected to state the actual reference standard adopted for Relative Humidity as mentioned in the abstract that '... at RH above 85% lead to FFA content above the standards'.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is well presented. However, the author should take note of the few punctuations omitted.	
Optional/General comments	The article is explanatory and well presented but the author should kindly follow the journal's author guidelines.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

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