



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_47051
Title of the Manuscript:	Physical Quality Responses of Cocoa Beans to Inclusion and Exclusion of Placenta and Varied Fermentation Periods
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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 <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>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- line no. 16 write exports to instead of exports about.- line no. 35 write processes instead of process, write breaks in instead of breaks down. <p style="text-align: center;">Material and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- line no. 47 write boundaries of instead of boundaries with.- line no. 70 write extracted from instead of extracted with, write extracted from instead of extracted without. <p style="text-align: center;">RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- line no. 130 write in total instead of in the Total.-line no. 146 write the highest instead of Highest.-line no. 149 write differences between instead of differences for.-line no. 154 write content of instead of content in.-line no. 164 write the highest instead of Highest.-line no. 166 write the highest instead of Highest, write least were instead of least was.-line no. 167 write the highest instead of Highest.-line no. 168 write least were instead of least was.-line no. 193 write the highest instead of highest.-line no. 198 write the highest instead of highest.-line no. 206 write the highest instead of highest.-line no. 211 write the highest instead of highest. <p style="text-align: center;">DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-line no. 238 write equivalents instead of equivalent.-line no. 239 write samples of instead of samples with.-line no. 242 write level may instead of levels_may.-line no. 244 write contents instead of content, write has been instead of has be, write that asserted instead of who_asserted .	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>-line no. 257 write the highest instead of highest.</p> <p>-line no. 260 write result of instead of result in.</p> <p>-line no. 265 write factors of instead of actors to.</p> <p>-line no. 270 write factors of instead of actors to.</p> <p>-line no. 280 write indicates instead of indicate.</p> <p>-line no. 287 write decrease from instead of decrease with.</p> <p>-line no. 295 write percentage of instead of percentage for, write extracted from instead of extracted with .</p> <p>-line no. 296 write had the highest instead of had highest.</p> <p>-line no. 297 write enhance instead of enhances.</p> <p>-line no. 298 write suggested that seeds instead of suggested that seed.</p> <p>-line no. 302 write entrance to entrance of.</p> <p>-line no. 304 write incidence of instead of incidence in.</p> <p>-line no. 307 write gave the highest instead of gave highest.</p> <p>-line no. 314 write defect instead of defects.</p> <p>-line no. 318 write impact on instead of impact of.</p> <p>-line no. 324 write consists of instead of consists of about.</p> <p>-line no. 325 write compositions instead of composition.</p> <p>-line no. 331 write the highest instead of highest.</p>	
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	X	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azza Anwar Abou- Arab
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt