

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_90684
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIAL ASSESSMENT OF SLAUGHTER SLABS IN ADO EKITI CENTRAL ABATTOIR
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:

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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	This is an interesting subject, a research article that fits the axis of food microbiology, particularly level of slaughter slabs hygiene and their risks to public health. It is a good paper but doesn't prevent giving some recommendations necessary to improve the manuscript. (please, see below)	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The remarks are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the manuscript is clear, well structured, and methodical -Please , I suggest the following title to the authors: Microbial assessment of slaughter slabs at the central slaughterhouse of Ado Ekiti -Please make sur to rectify the following mistakes: <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> not <i>Pseudomonas aureginosa</i> <i>Vibrio cholerae</i> not <i>Vibrio cholera</i> poliomyelitis not poilomyletis (discussion part significant difference ($P < 0.05$) not significant difference ($P < .05$) (results and discussion part Discussion part: please check the unit here '...(Fasanmi <i>et al.</i>, 2010) which is 5.54 CFU/m1 from meat sellers' No of occurrence in table 2 (Number of occurrence) like you cited in table 3 I don't know why the authors did not convert the charges obtained by mL into cm2 for example, because ultimately it was the surfaces that were microbiologically checked. Is not it? -please check again the reference N° 22 : WHO (?) -Author guidelines requirements must be respected (references). Good Luck 	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elhassan Benyagoub
Department, University & Country	Mohammed Tahri University of Bechar, Algeria