

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_122292
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of new fermentation systems on the health quality of cocoa beans ( <i>Theobroma cacao</i> L. 1753) in the main cocoa-growing regions of Côte d'Ivoire: Nawa, Bas-Sassandra and Haut-Sassandra
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 fact that it presents original research findings and focuses on practical adaptation strategies makes it a valuable contribution to the field. Overall, the manuscript appears to be a valuable addition to the scientific literature, providing actionable knowledge for researchers and policy makers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is okay.	
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.	Consider adding a sentence highlighting the practical implications of the study's findings for cocoa farmers and processors. You may also want to mention the sample size or number of replicates to give an idea of the study's scope. As for deletions, you might consider removing the sentence "The cocoa variety does not significantly impact fungal contamination or physicochemical parameters" to focus more on the main findings related to fermentation supports.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are okay.	
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 appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. Firstly, the study employs a rigorous experimental design, evaluating the impact of six different fermentation supports on the microbiological quality of cocoa beans, which allows for a comprehensive comparison of the effects of each support. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a high level of scientific rigor, with a clear and logical methodology, and a thorough analysis of the results, which contributes to its technical soundness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient. Some of them are old while others are current. There were about two of the intext references that did not follow the intext reference style of the journal e.g.: [1].	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is okay, just that the use of 'THE' was used in contexts it could have been avoided.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is good.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Elvis Dwamena, Asm</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b>