

Paper: “Evaluation de la qualité physicochimique et microbiologique du vinaigre issu de la pulpe de prunier mombin (*Spondias mombin* L.) produit au Bénin”

Submitted: 08 November 2022

Accepted: 08 December 2022

Published: 31 December 2022

Corresponding Author: Ezin Paul OGAN

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p425](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n40p425)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mr Yapo Thierry MONNET

Reviewer 2: Modou DIENG

Reviewer 3: Nyamador Wolali Seth

Mr Yapo Thierry MONNET

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-11-18 10:30 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*** The title is not clear and not also fully adequate to the content of the article. They make just an assay to show the qualities and a possible use of mombin plum in vinegar production. As they said in the abstract: "The present study aims to valorize the pulp of mombin plum fruits ".**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes, the abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results. The manuscript's title can be found with it.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Authors can find them in attached document.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** Yes.**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*** The body of the paper is clear but contain several errors. See attached document.**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** Rewrite the conclusion. It looks like a discussion. They are not vinegar producer. Instead, they have followed the method of obtaining vinegar from biological material. The analysis of the results found allows you to propose, to suggest the production of vinegar regarding its nutritional qualities. This would contribute to the valorisation of *S. mombin*. They have also to give some perspectives before ending the conclusion.**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** Many references in-text citation has not be included in the list of references and vice versa.**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I urge the authors to make any necessary corrections in the text to make this good work even easier to explore.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I strongly urge the editors to require all recommendations and corrections from the authors prior to publication of this scientific paper

Nyamador Wolali Seth

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2022-11-18 10:30 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequate to content of the manuscript but the authors must delete the word "Production" from the title

because at the end of the title they added the "produced in Benin"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract presents clearly the study aim, methods and the results obtained. However, the authors must begin the abstract with a small introduction before the study objectives.*

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, there are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the manuscript. I encourage the authors to correct them.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** The study methods are well explained**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*** The paper body is clear but contains some errors that may be corrected before publication of this article.**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** The Conclusion is accurate and supported effectively by the content**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** The list of References is appropriate but there are some authors cited in the text but not shown**

in the list of References. For example : Mbungu et al. (2016); Aboudou et al. (2017); Boizot et Charpentier et al. (2006); Dehpour et al. (2019) ; Manhães et al. (2011).

In the other hand, there are some references in the list but not viewed in the text as : Boizot et Charpentier (2006); Dehpour et al. (2009); Kowiou et al. (2017) and Mbungu (2016).

THE authors of this manuscript must take care of these remarks and give the right references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors must take care to my comments. They will find these comments in the text in the "Track changes" mode in the attached file.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Editors need to take care of my remarks and ask to authors to correct all the errors observed in the manuscript before they accept publish the manuscript. You will find my comments in the text in the "Track changes" mode in the attached file.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Dr Modou DIENG	
University/Country: University Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar / SENEGAL	
Date Manuscript Received: Nov. 10, 2022	Date Review Report Submitted: Dec. 19, 2022
Manuscript Title: Production et évaluation de la qualité physicochimique et microbiologique du vinaigre issu de la pulpe de prunier mombin (Spondias mombin L.) produit au Bénin	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No: YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No: YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No: YES	

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
The title is in perfect harmony with the content of the article	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The method of making vinegar from mombin plum pulp was not clearly presented in the summary	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There are few spelling mistakes in this article	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods are explained clearly.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
We did not find any errors in the results	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is consistent with the content of the text	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
the references are correct	

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):

We recommend that authors clearly specify the method of making vinegar in the abstract of the article

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

No comments