

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_122437
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical and Microbiological Characterization of Tamarind Pulp (Tamarindus Indica L) Sold in the Markets of Korhogo and Abidjan (Côte d'Ivoire)
Type of the Article	Original Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The current manuscript reports on several tamarind pulp samples' physicochemical and microbiological quality from two Ivory Coast cities. Different tests were assayed, but a concise conclusion was not drawn. Finally, which sample should be preferred for developing a product based on tamarind pulp? The authors stated they had made statistical analyses, but throughout the manuscript (Results part), these analyses are absent (in the figures, tables, or text)!	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract has 380 words. However, the journal guidelines indicate no more than 300 words! Please verify and correct it. The authors have to correct the writing of plants and microbial species. They must italicize them. Example: <i>Tamarindus indica</i> (Fabaceae) instead of Tamarindus Indica (See in the title), <i>Escherichia coli</i> instead of E. coli. Which Salmonella species have you used? Salmonella enterica , Salmonella Typhimurium?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I suggest the authors provide more information regarding the microbial species. What are the suppliers? Are they from ATCC? No information about culture media or their growth conditions? Moreover, I suggest the authors give the ecological and environmental conditions of the two cities. Are there any differences regarding the climate and soil characteristics? You are not unaware that the abiotic and biotic factors can influence the physicochemical, nutritional, microbiological, and therapeutic effects of plants!	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript needs to be rewritten.	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The authors must respect the authors guidelines regarding the reference style; “References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]”. Unfortunately, authors must modify their referencing style throughout the manuscript to comply with the guidelines: examples of bad referenes: Kambire et al. (2020) (Bourou et al., 2012; Garba et al., 2020). Moreover, some references listed at the end of the manuscript don’t appear in the text: see reference 8 (Okafor.....) The Introduction needs to be rewritten by adding some references. Although there are few reported studies on tamarind produced on the Ivory Coast, I suggest the authors provide results from studies reported elsewhere in Africa and around the world. Examples: Van den Bilcke. et al. Physico-chemical properties of tamarind (<i>Tamarindus indica</i> L.) fruits from Mali: selection of elite trees for domestication. Genet Resour Crop Evol 61, 537–553 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10722-014-0080-y</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I recommend that the authors have their manuscript checked by a native English speaker. The manuscript has a mix of French and English words! Part Materials and Methods 2.2 Les Tamarind samples Results 3.1 Caractéristiques physico-chimiques du tamarin? Figure 2 : fruits frais, fruits fermentés ??? In English, the comma is replaced by a point at the digits level: 0.7 ±0.03 instead of 0,7 ±0,03 (see Tables)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Some corrections are highlighted in yellow, and comments are included in the manuscript. However, the list is not exhaustive! There are still several orthographic and grammar issues!</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Boly Rainatou
Department, University & Country	Institute of Research in Health Sciences (IRSS), National Center for Scientific and Technological Research (CNRST), Burkina Faso