

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)	No Yes No, the abstract is not comprehensive and need to be rewrite. Summary of the methodology is missing. Also, there a lot of technical and grammatical errors. No, No	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript need a major corrections. There are grammatical errors in the manuscript. Almost all the methodologies used in the manuscript were not properly acknowledge. There results of the study was not properly presented. Each Table should be presented separate and not mix together. Check the arrangement of all your tables and redesign it. Some tables are best presented using landscape. For all the tables, a column for serial number should be provided. The discussion was not complete because some of the results were not discuss and not compare with results of other researchers in the same or related topic. The results of the study was also repeated in the discussion section by referring to some of the tables in the discussion. Headings are not required ion the discussion section.	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Bashir
Department, University & Country	Modibbo Adama University, Nigeria