SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARRB_40707**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Analysis of the predominant lactic acid microorganisms and proximate composition of spontaneously fermented gari and fufu, cassava food products**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract** 1. There is a need to recast the tittle and remove the word 'Analysis' 2. I will like to know the techniques the authors used in the identification of predominant lactic acid organisms (*Lactobacillus brevis* and *L plantarum)* isolated and (*Neurospora crassa*, *Aspergillus fumigatus* and *Saccharomyces spp*). I will advised the author to provide the data on 16s rRNA and 18srRNA of these isolates, otherwise, how did you come about these isolates using only cultural and morphological characteristics only?	**We have removed the word "analysis" from the title, as suggested by the reviewer.** **We used standard microbiological techniques for identifying (phenotypically) the predominant lactic acid organisms. The specific methods of isolation (anaerobic culturing) preclude non-target organisms and the identification methods used are well documented in the materials and methods section of the manuscript. We concur that phenotypic identification may be backed up with genotypic identification, this is part of our agenda for further work as we attempt to optimize the fermentation process, going forward. However, we do not have 16s rRNA data for our lactic acid organisms presently. Molecular work is still very expensive in Nigeria, we hope to attract funding after this initial self-funded work is published. When more funds become available, molecular and similar analyses will be carried out, going forward.**
	Introduction 3. There is a need to rewrite this section and write only relevant literature that can support this current study with current literature. There are so many published work in this contest. Please lay emphasis on the novelty as well as the problem statement why this research work was carried out. Please provide at least five current references in 2018 on cassava fermented products. 4. Please avoid repetition of what has been known in literature before.	**The Introduction has been re-written to be more succinct and old citations have been replaced with more current literature.** **The Introduction has been re-written to reflect the reviewer's observation.**
	Result and Discussion 5. Please provide 16SrRNA (*Lactobacillus brevis L plantarum)* and 18srRNA (*Neurospora crassa*, *Aspergillus fumigatus*) of these isolates with their	**We have only phenotypic identification data in the present study. Please refer to author comments number 2 above.**

	accession numbers and *Saccharomyces spp*. 6. Where did you come across this statement ‘’predominant starter organisms isolated from the *gari* samples with incidence values ranging from 0.1 – 0.6 x 10-8cfu/ml of samples’’ 7. Please provide the data on the CFU/g counts where the pure culture of the identified isolates in a tabular form for all the fermented products 8. ‘Please clarify how you come about this statement with quantitative data. ’However, the amount of occurring lactic acid bacteriaidentified as *Lactobacillus brevis* and *L plantarum* increased as the fermentation progressed. These bacterial organisms appeared to finish off the fermentation earlier initiated by the fungal isolates. Conversely, the lactic acid bacterium *Lactobacillus brevis* was more predominant in the fermentation of fufu, followed by the fungus, *Aspergillus fumigatus*, although just like in the case of *gari* fermentation, the bacterial organisms were predominant in the concluding part of the fermentation as the number of fungi gradually reduced’’. Discussion 9. The discussion section was poorly written. There is a need to rewrite with and discuss key/ relevant result with recent references 10. There is a need to include a conclusion with relevant key finding from this study.	**We added Figures 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b to provide more details on the succession of organisms during the fermentation processes. The incidence values have been updated accordingly as noted on lines 164 to 165 of the updated manuscript.** **Microbial counts have been presented in Figures 2 and 3.** **The requested quantitative data have been presented in Figures 2 and 3.** **The Discussion section has been re-written to reflect the reviewer’s observation.** **A conclusion sub-section has been added to the manuscript.**

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		