



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_49121
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF FERMENTATION ON THE NUTRIENT AND ANTI-NUTRIENT CONTENTS OF AFRICAN BUSH MANGO ( <i>Irvingia gabonensis</i> ) SEEDS
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect of fermentation on the nutrient and anti-nutrient content of African bush mango seeds was studied but details of fermentation are not given.</li> <li>There was improvement in the nutritional quality of the samples after fermentation compared with the raw samples but protein carbohydrates and fats are shown to decrease, clarify.</li> <li>The samples were surface sterilized with alcohol and washed with distilled water and still there was bacterial and fungal contamination, is the contamination seed borne?</li> <li>There is isolation of human bacterial pathogen and fungi known to produce aflatoxins from the samples during fermentation, how far it is safe to consume such food?</li> </ul>	<p>Thanks for the review. Corrections effected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first review is not clear as the details of fermentation is shown in the methodology, result and discussion</li> <li>The protein content for sample A increased from <math>10.34 \pm 0.08</math> to <math>12.09 \pm 0.04</math> while that of sample B increased from <math>17.39 \pm 0.03</math> to <math>26.44 \pm 0.12</math>. The carbohydrate content of sample A increased from <math>24.98 \pm 0.04</math> to <math>29.20 \pm 0.03</math> therefore only sample B recorded a decrease of <math>41.02 \pm 0.02</math> to <math>38.96 \pm 0.12</math> and this was attributed to the activities of microorganisms present. The reduction in fat content could be a welcome idea since fat is the highest composition in the seeds and they are generally considered to increase plasma cholesterol</li> <li>This was an oversight. The seeds were disinfected to reduce the number of microbial contaminants and not entirely eliminate them. The contaminants could be as a result of contamination during handling and processing</li> <li>Most of the contaminants were eliminated at the end of the fermentation. Even though not all the strains of fungi isolate have aflatoxin producing potential; consumers should be careful where they purchase from.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	As per above comments	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The advantage of defatted over raw fruit needs to be mentioned.	

**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?	<u>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	