

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_110259
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Air, Water, Soil, Hand Swabs, and Feeds Quality of Livestock Farms in the Southeast
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Understanding meat quality and microbial risks isn't just academic - it guides policy to ensure safe and healthy meat for all. While the paper is informative, I'd love to see it delve deeper into the scientific aspects.</p> <p>Title is fine, but to make it more concise and impactful some revisions are suggested.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Assessing Environmental and Feed Quality in Southeast Livestock Production" 2. "Southeast Livestock Farm Quality: A Comprehensive Assessment for Sustainable Improvement" <p>The result section in abstract is misleading e.g.: (259 (100%)). It needs to be rewritten for clarity and conciseness. Additionally, the sentence about four cities in the Southeast states lacks context; please specify the location."</p> <p>Please add line numbers and define a consistent numbering format for headings and subheadings. The manuscript's structure effectively guides the reader through the different sections.</p> <p>While the analysis seems thorough, DNA sequencing would likely uncover additional isolates (not mandatory).</p> <p>The references included are relevant and current. Expanding the list with a few more recent publications could further highlight your commitment to thorough research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>While the sentence conveyed its message, some grammatical inconsistencies and potentially unclear phrasing were noted. A language polish could make it even more effective.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study's strengths lie in its thorough evaluation of specific culturable bacteria across various farms in Southeast Nigeria, including source tracking and bacterial load estimation for heterotrophs, coliforms, and potential pathogens. The inclusion of sufficient samples and triplicate analyses is commendable. However, the statistical analysis and discussion sections need further development to reach publication-ready quality. I wholeheartedly recommend a revision focusing on these aspects to ensure your valuable research reaches its full potential.</p> <p>N.B.: Adding line numbers to the revision would be fantastic. It would enable me to reference specific lines when providing feedback, making it easier for you to understand my suggestions and implement them.</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:	Jovitha Lincy V.J.
Department, University & Country	St. Albert's College, India