

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_100867
Title of the Manuscript:	MOLECULAR DETECTION OF ENTEROTOXIGENIC STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS IN READY-TO-EAT COWHIDE [PONMO] COLLECTED FROM LAGOS METROPOLIS, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original

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>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Need revision</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Dear Editor There are already several reports enterotoxigenic Staphylococcus aureus in ready-to-eat cowhide, the data presented is not acceptable for publication in this journal. 1. In my opinion the English language of manuscript should be revised. The text is free of errors but is not fluent. Some of sentences found to be incomplete 2. The name of genes must be italic in text. 3. The abstract lacks detail of the study design and results and requires significant attention as it does not</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>accurately reflect the study. I appreciate that space is limited in the abstract but a lot of the text could be removed or shortened to add some of this necessary detail. 4. Keywords in manuscript are not according to the MESH. 5. Introduction is not proper and should be written according to the goal of research. The introduction would benefit from a brief description of what is already the fundamental problem in relation to the Staphylococcus aureus in ready-to-eat foods 6Why were these antibiotics selected . 7. A critical point in similar kinds of studies is selection of strains. Ideally, there needs to be a large number of randomly selected isolates. The biggest problem I see in the present work is why these were chosen and how. This should be clarified. In any case, how the set of these strains was compiled is crucial to the validity of this work and should be made crystal clear 8. It's not clear why these antibiotics were selected? a. What is the statistical analysis? 9. Please avoid repeating the results in the discussion section</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Mehdi Goudarzi
Department, University & Country	Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Iran