

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_98914
Title of the Manuscript:	Training of university catering stakeholders in good hygiene practices: a prerequisite to controlling the risks of Collective Food Poisoning (CFP) in Senegal's university campuses.
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. I think the manuscript is important because the main objective of it is to find the cause of CFP in elements such as hygiene, operators knowledge, etc.</p> <p>2. I think the title doesn't reflect the main objective of the paper since not only stakeholder's training is studied. It should be more like... Evaluation of the causes of collective Food Poisoning in ...</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is clear although it is necessary that a proofreading service review the document</p> <p>4. The structure is appropriate</p> <p>5. I think the review has some marks that should be address by the author</p> <p>a. The title must be more specific</p> <p>b. Introduction must be relate the background of the main point of the research to author's work.</p> <p>c. Materials and method section shouldn't be written in list form, it must be a well-presented and clear paragraph</p> <p>d. There isn't a clear explanation of the sampling method</p> <p>e. Methods for bacteriological analysis should be more specific. There are elements missing in it such as, sample handling, growth media used, quantification method</p> <p>f. Although some discussion is made, there has to be a better comparison of the work made by the author and the one made by others. Also, the author should be address to the main causes of the phenomena observed</p> <p>g. Change the language of the figures</p> <p>6. I think there aren't, discussion and introduction should me more specific</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No, the paper should be review by a proofreading service	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Teresa Gladys Cerón Carrillo
Department, University & Country	Benemérida Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México