

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 stands out due to its relevance in highlighting potential risks associated with RTE foods and the need for adequate safety measures to protect consumers from foodborne illnesses. The findings of the study, including the identification of bacterial species, their antibiotic resistance patterns, and the potential for hemolysis, contribute valuable information to the existing literature on food safety. The manuscript's emphasis on the importance of enforcing safety measures to reduce the spread of pathogenic bacterial contaminants in RTE foods further underscores its significance in promoting consumer wellbeing.</p> <p>Author has to put more effort on statistical analysis part and try to mention SD in graphs..</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Potential Title : Antibiotic Susceptibility and Hemolytic Activity of Bacterial Isolates from Ready-To-Eat Foods in Baze University Student Cafeteria.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To give readers a better idea of the scope and representativeness of the results, it would be helpful to provide the total number of ready-to-eat food samples that were evaluated during the study. • Give a brief explanation of the common microbiological techniques employed. The study's methodology would be made clearer by including a brief explanation of the precise microbiological techniques used for the isolation and identification of bacterial species. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>There are missing of some key heading like conflict-of-interest statement, acknowledgment and funding source information rest of sub sections 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>Methodological Rigor: The manuscript explains how to isolate and identify different types of bacteria using standard microbiological techniques. This suggests a strict and tried-and-true method to guarantee precise and legitimate results.</p> <p>Comprehensive Analysis: The investigation examined the isolates' capacity to make hemolysins, their patterns of antibiotic sensitivity, and their potential to cause foodborne disease, in addition to evaluating the bacteriological quality of ready-to-eat foods. A detailed understanding of the microbiological contamination and related dangers in the examined food samples is provided by this thorough investigation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>According to me author should have cite more reference regarding methodology and In discussion to justify their results. The reference style is not same, please have a look.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Jahan Zaib Ashraf
Department, University & Country	University of Foggia, Italy