

Manuscript: **“Physico-Chemical, Microbiological and Antioxidant Properties of Some Local Honey Samples from Senegal”**

Submitted: 03 August 2021

Accepted: 02 September 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Souleymane Aidara

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n37p200

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Prince Chigozie, Electronics and Computer Unit, Department of Physics, University of Calabar, Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|---|--|
| Reviewer Name: Valeria Santa | |
| University/Country: Universidad Nacional Río Cuarto- Argentina | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 2021-08-19 | Date Review Report Submitted: 2021-08-23 |
| Manuscript Title: Physicochemical and microbiological qualities and antioxidant power of some local honey samples (Senegal) | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 52-08-2021 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/ No | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|---|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 5 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>There are few mistakes in text</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 4 |
| <i>I believe there are some errors in the formulas</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <i>The authors name are not cite in text. In some cases they are cite by number and in others they are cite by last name. Also when the authors are cite by last name, the year of publication is not present</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I would like to make some comments and questions. I am a microbiologist and also teach beekeeping, and the analysis you can make to honey. And I would like exchange some information with you:

- To determine the Humidity of honey and other sweet products as jams, we use a refractometer. It is very easy to use and allows you to make quick determination.
- I would like to know where you obtained this information from: CFU: one colony corresponds to 10^4 germs/ml. As far as I know the results are express as CFU, and we cannot know how many germs formed a colony.
- We also make others analysis to honey, like apparent sucrose, hydroxymethylfurfural and diastase activity, that help us to know how the honey was stored and if it was heated.
- "Fecal coliform testing is performed to monitor fecal contamination of foods

that have not been treated to destroy Enterobacteriaceae”..... I believe honey cannot be treated (or the treatment is so expensive), and fecal contamination gets to honey because is mishandled (people with dirty hands)

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|--|
| Date Manuscript Received: 22-08-2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 24-08-2021 |
| Manuscript Title: | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 5 |
| <i>(Oui)</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 2 |
| <i>(les objectifs ne sont pas clairs, les applications de l'étude sont absent)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 5 |
| <i>(Oui, les methods sont clairement expliquées)</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 5 |
| <i>(Oui)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 2 |
| <i>(le résumé doit être revue)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 5 |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|---|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | × |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

L'objectif, dans le résumé est absent, et les applications du travail n'y figure pas.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

| | |
|--|--|
| Reviewer Name: | |
| University/Country: Anambra State Polytechnic Mgbakwu, Anambra, Nigeria | |
| Date Manuscript Received: 21/08/2021 | Date Review Report Submitted: 27/08/2021 |
| Manuscript Title: Physicochemical and microbiological qualities and antioxidant power of some local honey samples (Senegal) | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0852/21 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No | |

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

| <i>Questions</i> | <i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|---|--|
| 1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. | 3 |
| <i>The Title may be recast according to the suggestion made in the manuscript for more aptness.</i> | |

| | |
|--|----------|
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 3 |
| <i>The abstract reasonably presented the objects, methods and results. However, findings should be more technically expressed as required in academic research. The suggestions made in the manuscript could be useful.</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>Although no spelling errors were found, there were few weak grammatical expressions. Such lapses were indicated in the manuscript.</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>The study methods were clearly explained but not without default. More pronounced is varying the packaging material for some of the samples, which could influence the results obtained. Even conditions should be provided for samples under study to avoid bias, and to eliminate sources of error.</i> | |
| 5. The results are clear and do not contain errors. | 3 |
| <i>The values presented in Table 2 should be corrected to replace commas with decimals in all the values provided as suggested in the manuscript. Also the values for pH should be edited particularly for the EU and CA standards. Furthermore, the discussion of results should be simultaneous with the obtained values according to the suggestion made in the manuscript.</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 2 |
| <i>The conclusion was poorly executed. It should be a concise summary of the content and possible suggestion of areas for further studies. This was clearly pointed out in the manuscript.</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 3 |
| <i>The references may be comprehensive to the extent of what is revealed by search of literature. There are, however, few cases where the authors used both names and numbers in citations. A common method approved by the Journal must be followed.</i> | |

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

| | |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed | |
| Accepted, minor revision needed | X |
| Return for major revision and resubmission | |
| Reject | |

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): The work is purposeful and calls for further research. Kindly consider the suggestions made in the manuscript in the present and subsequent research.