

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_96965
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROBIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF FRESH CATFISH (<i>Clarias gariepinus</i>) OBTAINED FROM SELECTED MARKETS AND PONDS IN MINNA METROPOLIS
Type of the 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.journalejnf.com/index.php/EJNFS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community 2. Yes , the title of the article is suitable 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive 4. Yes, most of the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct, about methods no need to mentioned the details of each test specially the classic test 6- Most of the references are sufficient but too old most of them between 1990-2000 and recent,	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications	
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:	Fattma A. Ali
Department, University & Country	Hawler Medical University, Iraq