

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_120336
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacteriological Assessment of Ready-To-Eat Foods Sold in Baze University Student Cafeteria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community due to its rigorous assessment of the bacteriological quality of ready-to-eat (RTE) foods within Baze University. By identifying and characterizing bacterial contaminants, assessing their potential to produce toxins like hemolysins, and evaluating antibiotic resistance profiles, the study addresses critical gaps in understanding food safety in educational settings. Its findings underscore the urgent need for enhanced food safety measures and education among food handlers to mitigate health risks associated with RTE foods. Overall, I appreciate this manuscript for its practical insights into foodborne microbial risks and its potential implications for public health policies and practices.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Bacteriological Assessment of Ready-To-Eat Foods Sold in Baze University Student Cafeteria" effectively conveys the focus and scope of the study. It clearly identifies the subject (bacteriological assessment), the object (ready-to-eat foods), and the specific location (Baze University Student Cafeteria). However, for added clarity and specificity, you might consider a slight modification:</p> <p>Alternative Title: "Bacteriological Evaluation of Ready-to-Eat Foods in Baze University Student Cafeterias"</p> <p>This alternative title maintains the essence of the original while slightly adjusting the wording for a clearer emphasis on evaluation and including "cafeterias" to encompass multiple food vending sites within the university.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is clear and succinct, effectively summarizing the study's purpose, methods, findings, and implications. Keywords are included to highlight the focus areas of the study.</p> <p>Gaps:</p> <p>While the abstract is comprehensive, it could benefit from mentioning the specific types of RTE foods sampled (spaghetti, fried rice, etc.) and their distribution across vending sites. There is no mention of study limitations or future research directions, which could provide context for interpreting the findings.</p> <p>Briefly mention any limitations of the study (e.g., sample size, specific methodologies) and suggest potential avenues for future research (e.g., longitudinal studies, intervention trials).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its methodical approach to assessing the bacteriological quality of RTE foods sold at Baze University. The study employs standard microbiological techniques for sampling, isolation, and identification of bacterial species, ensuring reliability and reproducibility of results. Additionally, the inclusion of antibiotic susceptibility testing and hemolysin production assays provides comprehensive insights into potential health risks associated with these foods. Moreover, the manuscript integrates findings with relevant literature, enhancing its scientific context and contributing valuable data to the field of food microbiology and public health.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references chosen provide a comprehensive background and context for the study on RTE foods at Baze University. They cover a range of topics including specific pathogens (Staphylococcus, Streptococcus, Corynebacterium), microbial contamination in various food types, antimicrobial resistance, and outbreaks related to foodborne illnesses. This breadth of literature strengthens the scientific basis of the study and supports the conclusions drawn regarding the microbial quality and safety concerns of RTE foods.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article seem generally suitable for scholarly communication. But, pay attention to grammar, syntax, and sentence structure to convey information effectively and professionally.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Audrey Herbert Yépié
Department, University & Country	University of Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire