

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_90060
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of X-gal, ONPG and MUG Assay developed methods with IS methods by Analyzing Milk Samples
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction of sentences is poor. Work on your grammar and punctuations. Sentences not clear are <u>underlined</u> in the manuscript. Additional comments are in uppercase, red font and in bracket. 2. Explain abbreviations used. 3. Methodology is not clear. Write your protocols properly and in sequence. And please use scientific terminologies. Be precise about the measurements used. Explain your materials and methods such that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiment. 4. Results are poorly presented. Use appropriate table format. 5. Discussion too long and irrelevant. Discussion should be based on your research findings. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction addresses the scope of research. Objectives were relevant and interesting. 2. Conclusions were consistent with results. However, discussions are not comprehensive. 3. One of the references cited in the text (Begley et al., 2005) is not on the reference list. 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript addresses the scope of the research and has contributed to the advancement of the discipline. Therefore, it is recommended for publication. However, corrections should be effected before publication. See original manuscript for additional comments and suggestions.	

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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Danjuma, Florence Yachim
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria