

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_97614
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacteriological Assessment of Smoked-Dried White Shrimp (<i>Nematopalaemon hastatus</i> Aurivillius, 1898) Sold in Calabar, Nigeria
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.journalejns.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. The question, the author tries to answer is of great importance. The manuscript is scientifically sound and worth researching on. 2. The title of the manuscript is suitable with the content. 3. The abstract is well written and shows the main results. Although too summarized. 4. The structure of the manuscript seems good. However, the results are not presented in subsections. The author has presented a lone result in the manuscript. Although scientifically sound, questions are posed as to whether the researcher has just the diseases found on white crayfish to present as result. 5. The manuscript is scientifically sound. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. 7. The author should consult the manuscript attached to this review form for additional comments.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable, albeit with some minor grammatical errors.	
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:	Efuetlancha Ernest Nkemele
Department, University & Country	University of Dschang, Cameroon