

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_127315
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial Profile of smoked fish sold in selected Markets in Ibadan Metropolis

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only based on '**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>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	No particular importance. Comparison of 3 markets.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Smoked fish is used in title. Roasted fish is used in materials and method. Correct it.	
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.	Nil	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	ok	
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 aim is to determine microbial load of smoked fish sold in select markets in Ibadan, Oyo State. But when it comes to materials and methods, roasted fish is used Bacterial load of $0.35 \pm 0.11 \times 10^3$ cfu/g observed in fish samples from Taska and $0.12 \pm 0.10 \times 10^3$ cfu/g from Molete market is a low bacterial cfu value. Why this much lowering of bacterial load? <b>Fig1 and table 1 contains same data. Repetition of data.</b>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	nil	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Degree Celsius needs to be corrected with proper symbol. Spacing errors.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Nil	

### 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:	Dhanya P. R
Department, University & Country	M.E.S Asmabi College, University of Calicut, India