

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_111798
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological quality of edible frogs and proximate composition analysis
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The edible frogs might be came as new health problem for people who consumed it especially for zoonosis issue which animals acted as diseases vectors. By knowing its microbial content, people will ignore how the best way to process raw materials to become edible food and not harmful to human. This is the reason why the study played important role for human. Beside that from the study we could gain some facts about microbes biology, ecology, habitat, endotoxin, and nutrition component in frog. Also, the study informed us how to manage and control the usage of wild animal for food 2. The structure of title is not enough good. It will be better if the title: " The Microbial Content and Proximate Composition of Edible Frogs <i>Pelophylax esculentus</i>" 3. The abstract already consisted of background, purpose, results, and conclusion. But, it needs to put the brief methods In abstract too so it would be complete. 4. The subsections and structure already corrected 5. As generally yes, but there were some parts still need more explanation, for instance in methods how the name of spesies were conclude, based on just media coloration or anything else. In method, it should clearly stated number of ethical clearence, how to handle the frogs, how many frogs that used, etc. In CFU results, how many dilution that performed. In result visualization, it would be better if the graphs informed the avarage value from 3 collections, so there would be only 1 graphs for CFU. 6. The references were not enough, it still need more and recent papers. <p>The discussion part need more explanations about the reasons of species in results and the proximate values. Compared with previous reports about microbes and nutrition facts. Also state the impact for human walfare if they don't ignore the microbial contamination in foods.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>There were some mistakes in structure and typo. It needs to reread in order to get coherency and consistency of paragraphs</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Riris Lindiawati Puspitasari
Department, University & Country	University Al Azhar, Indonesia