

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_128543
Title of the Manuscript:	The timeline of progress in fermented food research in the Republic of the Congo: A meta-analytic review
Type of the Article	Meta-Analysis

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides information on traditional fermented food (TFF) researches conducted in the Republic of the Congo between 1986 and 2024 (38 years). Additionally, it provides information on the historical background of TFFs in the study area. Furthermore, the manuscript does not only elaborate on the beginnings of TFF researches in the study area but highlights the advances in modern research and bioactive compounds. Lastly, the manuscript provides some useful illustrations, figures, and tables to guide the readers and scientific community.	
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.	Yes. The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	Yes. The manuscript is scientifically correct.	
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 and recent. However, the author(s) were advised to follow the Journal's referencing format accordingly.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Some minor comments were made in the manuscript. The author(s) were advised to effect the corrections.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Muhammad Sanyinna
Department, University & Country	Nigerian Army University Biu, Nigeria