Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_113409**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ASSESSMENT OF MICROBIAL INTERACTIONS BETWEEN STARTER POTENTIAL LACTIC ACID BACTERIA AND MAJOR MICROORGANISMS DURING IN VITRO FERMENTATION IN A MEDIUM SIMILAR TO COCOA PULP IN COTE D'IVOIRE**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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)*
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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes** **The title can be revised to;** 'The Performance of Monoculture and Coculture Methods During In Vitro Fermentation'. A Case of Cocoa Starters in Cote D'ivoire **The abstract is well written but** should be revised by complying to the comments for example The problem statement and the methods used in this study should have been included and the recommendation of the study should be clearly stated **Yes** **Absolutely yes! However,** the manuscript needs revision especially the contextualization of the data should be well balance. The findings in this study must centrally dissolve the argument other researchers recently found. The results must be fully explained and provide evidence why they are like that, and what brought the deviation and must be scientifically backed up. Normally studies are meant to bring a solution; so it is not advisable that users who want to adopt should be using all the LAB cultures. In the study; monoculture and coculture methods were used. So which one was ideal and the one that is ideal monoculture for example, where you used 3 LAB, 2 yeast m strains, bacillus and 2 AAB.....of these which one perfermed exceptional. The recommendation is made on the strain that concuratively performed well in all the parameters under study. Your discussions says LAB performed well under pH, lactic acid biomass load but on reducing sugars it was the cocultures. So how can you balance this to make a concicive recommendation or conclusion. **Yes! The majority are recent but those below 90s should be removed or replaced**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	English is quite well but they have to run a grammar check and proofread the manuscript. They should use simple words and avoid too much jargons. When reporting, normally use the past tense	
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tijoy Lowore**
Department, University & Country	**Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resource, Malawi**