

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Biotechnology Journal International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_BJI_74924 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Risk Factors for Spoilage of Groundnut Seeds in Shops During Marketing |
| 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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) |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> | <p>The topic, that the manuscript attempts to investigate, is of primary interest. Seed spoilage is one of the major problems faced by seed vendors in major markets especially in Sub-Sahara Africa. However, the author must reorganize some sections of the manuscript in order to make it attractive to readers.</p> <p>Although this is a descriptive study, all the steps taken in data collection and analysis must be succinctly presented. Although the author attempted to show the sampling techniques used in this study, it seems to me that the nothing has been done to show how the data was analyzed. Meanwhile the M&M section is well written, it is tedious to replicate resulting to a limited scientific soundness. I suggest the author reorganizes the text and information contained under the following subheadings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Study site ➤ Survey materials ➤ Sampling procedure ➤ Data collection procedure ➤ Data analysis procedure <p>This will make the methodology attractive and easy to replicate.</p> <p>The study site should be the first item to be presented under the M&M section before the survey materials.</p> <p>Among the risk factors of oilseed spoilage, the author did made mentioned of varieties of seed marketed and knowledge of exact origin of oilseeds. These seeds are small-grain and large-grain varieties. But the author failed to tell us which variety among the two is liable to attack which makes it a risk factor for spoilage. The author also mentioned that the seeds are mainly from the North, East and centre part of the country. The question here is: How is that a risk factor for oilseed spoilage? Is it a 'rule of thumb' that any oilseed from the North, East, Centre of Côte d'Ivoire is liable to fungal attack? The author simply outlined these factors and failed to tell us the reason while they are considered as risk factors of oilseed spoilage. I suggest this should be revised.</p> <p>The discussion is not enough. The author has spent time describing his results and comparing with previous findings without giving his justifications and how his findings fill a gapping knowledge void in this regard. I strongly suggest the author addresses the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Present his findings and give his own justification or hypothesis that may explain his results (<i>this has partially been done by the author</i>), ➤ Compare his findings with previews findings in this domain, ➤ Finally, give new insights that his findings have added to the previous literature or the knowledge gap that his findings have come in to fill. <p>The Conclusion Section should have some suggestions and/or recommendations for proper groundnut seeds storage. You cannot conclude a scientific finding without some plausible suggestions.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> | <p>There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript. I have an impression that the author is a non-English speaker. I strongly suggest the author invites a native English to proofread the manuscript for minor grammatical errors. The author should choose to use British or American English. For example, "favorable" and "favourable" are two different spellings noticed in this manuscript. The author should choose to use one of them. In the last paragraph of the Discussion Section, the author wrote ..."Other work has indicated..." I think it should be "Other works have indicated..."</p> | |

Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Personal pronouns are not suitable for scientific publications in English, albeit that is done in French publications. For instance, the use of “we” in this manuscript has no raison d’etre.</p> <p>The author must revisit the Result Section and correct the numbering.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Even though the author have made mentioned of risks factors of seed spoilage at post-harvest, I think the author should have addressed the risk factors in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pre-harvest conditions ➤ Harvest and post-harvest ➤ Transport and transit ➤ Warehouse storage <p>This is because some factors leading to seed spoilage originate from pre-harvest conditions, transport and transit conditions and warehouse storage only cannot be accountable for this spoilage.</p> <p>For further reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dange, S. R. S. & Patel, V. J. (1984). Effect of relative humidity and storage period on fungi invasion and viability of groundnut seeds. <i>Bulletin of grain technology (India)</i>, 22: 225-231. • Fagbohun, E. D. & Faleye, O. S. (2012).The Nutritional and Mycoflora changes during storage of groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i>). <i>International Journal of Agronomy and Agricultural Research</i>, 2(6):15-22. • Subrahmanyam, P., Wongkaew, S., Reddy, D., Demski, J., McDonald, D., Sharma, S. & Smith, D. (1992). Field diagnosis of groundnut diseases. <i>Information Bulletin No.36.Int.Crops. Res. Inst. For the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) India</i>, 78pp. • Sullivan, G. A. (1984). Seed and seedling diseases In: Compendium of peanut diseases. Porter D.M., Smith D. H. & Rodriguez K. (Eds.) pp 37-38, St Paul Minesota, USA Phytopathological Society. | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Efuetlancha Ernest Nkemeleke |
| Department, University & Country | University of Dschang, Cameroon |