

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_126694
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Microbial Contamination and Characterization of Bacteria Isolated from Whole and Sliced Ready-to-Eat Fruits Sold in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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>

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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is relevant as it highlights food safety concerns linked to microbial contamination in ready-to-eat (RTE) fruits sold in an urban setting, specifically Port Harcourt, Nigeria. Given the increasing demand for minimally processed and convenient foods, this research sheds light on public health risks from bacterial contamination. The study's findings on hygiene practices and contamination sources contribute valuable data to improve food safety protocols in markets with limited regulatory oversight.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Assessment of Microbial Contamination and Characterization of Bacteria Isolated from Whole and Sliced Ready-to-Eat Fruits Sold in Port Harcourt, Nigeria," accurately reflects the study's focus on contamination and bacterial characterization. However, a more concise option could be: "Microbial Contamination and Bacterial Characterization in Ready-to-Eat Fruits from Port Harcourt Markets, Nigeria."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the study's aims, methodology, findings, and recommendations. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the specific bacterial types identified, as this would give readers insight into the types of pathogens present. Additionally, mentioning the study's significance for public health would further contextualize its importance.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections, which makes it easy to follow. Each section covers critical aspects of the study, from the study area and methodology to statistical analysis, contributing to its overall scientific rigor and coherence.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is scientifically robust, utilizing standard microbiological techniques to quantify bacterial contamination and identify isolates. The authors have implemented appropriate sampling and methodological protocols to ensure accuracy and reproducibility. The use of statistical analysis to assess significant differences across markets and fruit types adds depth to the findings and strengthens the manuscript's validity. This level of rigor, coupled with the use of a wide range of biochemical tests, ensures that the results are reliable and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are relevant and adequate for the study, with a balance of recent and foundational works. However, considering the rapid evolution of antimicrobial resistance, recent publications from the past three years on antibiotic resistance in foodborne pathogens could further strengthen the literature context.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical revisions could improve readability, especially in complex sections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study is highly valuable as it addresses food safety risks in a specific context, underscoring the need for targeted regulatory interventions in local markets. Further research might explore seasonal variations in contamination levels, which could provide additional insights into risk management. I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.</p> <p>The manuscript presents a comprehensive study with clear objectives, a well-defined methodology, and insightful discussion on microbial contamination in ready-to-eat fruits. The choice of sample types, markets, and microbial analyses are appropriate, and the manuscript includes important public health implications. The introduction and methodology sections could benefit from slight reorganization for conciseness, and some sentences may need rephrasing for clarity. Additionally, the discussion would be strengthened by a more detailed comparison with previous studies, particularly within Nigeria and comparable regions. The manuscript meets scientific standards and provides valuable information relevant to public health and food safety. Minor revisions should improve readability and coherence, but the core content is strong.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kedir Abdi Hassen</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Haramaya University, Ethiopia</p>