

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_84410
Title of the Manuscript:	Post-harvest system and quality of cocoa beans in the southern region of Cameroon
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalejnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The font size of the tables should be consistent throughout the manuscript Table 8 Needs further improvement in a technical manner to align with the standard of a scientific table. There is need for consistency in the use of words e.g “colour” in line 28 (section 2) and the rest of the manuscript Lines 58-163 section 2): The references need improvement.	Corrected Done
Minor REVISION comments	Line 7: Remove “a” between that and commercial Line 8: Replace “Investigations had been made” with “an investigation was made” Line 9: Replace “had been” with “was “ Line 21: Remove “their” between “and” and “drying” Line 45: Insert comma (,) after 2015; remove “, of” between rejected and part Line 54: Insert “of” between improvement and the Line 59-65: A reader will be interested in why the study was conducted in the southern region of Cameroon. Could it be the most producing region? Line 70: Remove ‘ on producers; insert “of” between rate and 40 Line 91: Remove “by” between calculated and using; remove “Tunde-Akintunde and Akintunde” ; remove “Unal et al” Line 99: Replace “on” with “using”; Remove “Hamid & Lopez” between by and [16]; remove “and Hii <i>et al.</i> ” between [16] and [17]; then write the two citations as [16,17] Line 101: Remove “Shamsuddin and Dimik” between by and [18]. Please note that when you are using numbers of references you don’t include the author details in the text. Line 115: Move “method” to between AFNOR and [22] Line 116: Replace “mixure” with “mixture”; put space between pH and meter in “pHmeter”; and for citations do as in the comment on line 99. Line 118: Remove “Hamid & Lopez” between by and [16] Line 119: Remove “Bourelly” between by and [24]. Please work on these citations elsewhere in the manuscript such as Lines: 131, 134, 146,155,165, 170,197,200, 227, 260-261, 282-283, 286, 313,329,331, 342,347,348-349, 361,365,379, and then in section 2 Lines: 2,17 and 22(You can take the example you put at the beginning of line 229) Line 167: Replace “its” with “they” Remove space between lines 175 and 179 Line 264: Replace “awared” with “aware” Line 36(section 2) insert space between the full stop and “Very”	All the suggested correction have been done
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is split into two sections which came about as a result of insertion of tables 6 and 7. Harmonize this if possible.	

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>	