

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_98184
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the biochemical, physicochemical and microbiological quality of soft drinks sold in some elementary school of williamsville (Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire)
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.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This paper evaluated the nutritional assessment and the sanitary conditions as measured by the level of microbial contamination of drinks that school children may consume in Côte d'Ivoire. Continuous nutritious and hygienic evaluation on an ongoing basis is of great significance in protecting children's health. While this paper seems sound in its fundamental principles, it needs to be more accurate in interpreting the results. The interpretation of the results must need to be corrected as follows.</p> <p>2. Title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The interpretation of the results needs to be reconsidered, and the abstract needs to be revised.</p> <p>4. I did not understand why only Salmonella spp. should be independent as 3.1.4; it could be integrated with 3.1.3. If only Salmonella spp. were to be independent, the introduction should explain the reason.</p> <p>5. The interpretation of the results must be corrected as follows. E. coli Rapid 2 medium is a selective medium for screening <i>E. coli</i> or coliforms. <i>E. coli</i> coliforms should be counted when evaluating fecal-derived contamination, for example, and <i>E. coli</i> (purple colonies) should be detected when the goal is to quantify biological <i>E. coli</i>, such as an outbreak caused by a specific pathogenic <i>E. coli</i>. It should be clarified whether the results in this paper are coliforms or <i>E. coli</i>, and the purpose should be explained in the introduction section. Similar to the above, Mossel medium propagates not only the biological <i>Bacillus cereus</i> but also the harmless <i>Bacillus</i> spp. Since the results of this paper are not a quantification of <i>B. cereus</i>, the results, etc., should at least be described as <i>Bacillus</i> spp. Mossel medium also develops <i>B. mycoides</i> and <i>B. thuringiensis</i>, which are indistinguishable from <i>B. cereus</i>. The same is true for Staphylococcus aureus, and the results and interpretation should be described as <i>Staphylococcus</i> spp. Rapid Staph medium detects coagulase-producing <i>Staphylococcus</i> spp. but is not necessarily consistent with <i>S. aureus</i> in the biological sense. This result is not always constant with <i>S. aureus</i> in the biological sense. Scientific names of organisms should be written in <i>italics</i>. ex) Bacillus cereus -> <i>Bacillus cereus</i> Please fix the numbers in the table as they are not written correctly. ex) 3,4±0,03 -> 3.4 ±0.03 3,1.10³± 144,6 -> 3.1 × 10³ ± 144.6 "The analysis revealed a high water content in soft drinks. " The main ingredient of the beverage is, of course, water, so I did not understand the intent of this statement. Therefore, it should be deleted.</p> <p>6. "This increase in sugar content would make the substrate available for the development of microorganisms. This development of microorganisms is perfectly in agreement with the work of Omoruyi et al. [20] which showed that, the more a food contains sugars the more quickly it will degrade. " I did not understand why you cited this reference. Although the presence of sugar is advantageous for the growth of microorganisms, the growth rate slows down when the sugar level becomes somewhat high due to a decrease in water activity. Also, the paper cited here is about the decomposition of solid foods, not the growth of microorganisms in beverages. Therefore, this phrase is either unnecessary, or you should find other citations that discuss microbial growth using sugar in drinks as a parameter and cite them appropriately.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I don't see any major problems in English. Please briefly describe whether children in the areas surveyed drink these beverages often in connection with the school. Different countries and regions have different cultural backgrounds. It would be helpful to have a background section that explains whether it is usual to buy and drink locally available beverages on the way to and from school in a way that readers in different countries and regions can easily understand.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There is a severe flaw in interpreting results from detecting bacteria using selective media. It needs to be corrected.</p>	

[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:	Okamoto Akira
Department, University & Country	Aichi University of Education, Japan