

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_101681
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS AND PRACTICE OF GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICES (GMP) AMONG STREET FOOD VENDORS IN CATARMAN, NORTHERN SAMAR
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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important, especially with the increasing patronizing of street foods.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable</p> <p>Yes, but it needs to talk about the findings or results of the research.</p> <p>Yes. Yes, provided the basic corrections are made.</p> <p>No, there is a need for more recent references to be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language needs to be revised for a clearer understanding of the work.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The following highlighted places with insert numbers (1), (2), (3) to (12) need to be worked on and revised for a clearer understanding.</p> <p>(1) There is no connection between the statement and the conclusion. "The High-tech Industries Development Zone had the fewest street vendors who were knowledgeable about food safety, which is probably because these areas are situated in rural-urban borderline zones with generally low educational levels." The concluding part contradicts the statement and must be revised. It could be in this form: "The High-tech Industries Development Zone had the fewest street vendors who were knowledgeable about food safety. The rural-urban borderline zones are generally with low educational levels which could be attributed to the higher patronage of street food vendors."</p> <p>(2) There should be references to support the statement.</p> <p>(3) Fweja <i>et al.</i> (3). Should be Fweja <i>et al.</i> Italic form.</p> <p>(4) Trafiaek <i>et al.</i> (2018) suggest (4) that the reason for better hygienic conditions in Poland may be better general education of street food vendors (5). It should read "Trafiaek <i>et al.</i> (2018) suggested that the reason for better hygienic</p> <p>(5) conditions in Poland may be that there is better general education for street food vendors.</p> <p>(6) There should be a reference to support the statement.</p> <p>(7) There should be a reference to support the statement.</p> <p>(8) The statistical Methods used names must be provided</p> <p>(9) Check the spelling of toilettes.</p> <p>(10) They are much known on using. It should read "They are much known for using.</p> <p>(11) to maintain (11) cleanliness. It should read " to maintain the cleanliness.</p> <p>(12) To improve. It should read 'to improving the safety of street foods..</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:	Fred Newman Coleman
Department, University & Country	Methodist University, Ghana