

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_97198
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Halal Criteria of Beef Microbiological Quality Intended for Export in Slaughterhouses of Khartoum State, Sudan
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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>The manuscript submitted to this journal entitled " Evaluation of Halal Criteria of Beef Microbiological Quality Intended for Export in Slaughterhouses of Khartoum State, Sudan " is an interesting topic for publication. But the authors need to make some minor revisions, which is given below:</p> <p>1) The topic of the manuscript is interesting and important for the scientific community. Dealing with this topic is very interesting and exciting and has a high scientific level and also is acceptable to the scientific community.</p> <p>2) The title of this manuscript is ambiguous and needs to be corrected.</p> <p>3) The abstract section is very short and the contents are not arranged and the conclusion is not clearly reported.</p> <p>4) The subsections and structure of the manuscript are inappropriate.</p> <p>5) The manuscript is scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>6) There is no reference section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	- No. The manuscript should be corrected in terms of native English grammar.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	-The introduction section is very short and needs to be corrected. - The discussion section should be added to the text of the manuscript.	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maziar Naderi
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Iran