

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_112219
Title of the Manuscript:	Behavior of Listeria monocytogenes during shelf-life of fresh refrigerated pesto sauce, characterized, according to regulation (EU) 2073/2005 and subsequent amendments, by chemical-physical parameters suitable for its growth.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. but the way it has been written, weakens its strengths. I have provided extensive comments and hope will help to improve it if complied.</p> <p>Not suitable; alternatively, Microbial safety and physical chemical properties of fresh refrigerated pesto sauce</p> <p>The abstract is not robust, needs to be revised. Introduce the topic under study, the problem it tries to solve, the significance and impact of the study. State the methods used, the research finding and the conclusion based on the findings. Clearly state what was the shelf life of each of the products studied.</p> <p>The methodology section should start with sample collection and preparation. The results section should start with microbial safety/shelf life. The methodology should clearly include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. how did you sample the 48 samples from the market, what criteria sampling techniques did you implore? 2. were the aseptic techniques followed? 3. were the physical chemical parameters be measured right at the market?, where exactly? 4. did you bring the samples to the laboratory? If so, how did you carry them to the laboratory... 5. what was the weight of each sample that you collected 6. what study design did you use? <p>Yes it is, but the way it has been written, weakens its strengths. I have provided extensive comments and hope will help if complied</p> <p>Some suggested references;</p> <p>Food and Drug Administration. (2013). <i>Revised Guidelines for the Assessment of Microbiological Quality of Processed Foods</i>. FDA. Philippine. Retrieved from https://food.chemlinked.com/database/view/2922</p> <p>Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and World Health Organization. (2019). <i>Codex Alimentarius Commission – Procedural Manual twenty-seventh edition</i>. Rome. 254 pp. Retrieved from http://www..codexalimentarius.org</p> <p>International Commission on Microbiological Specifications for Foods, (1986). <i>Microorganisms in Foods 2. Sampling for Microbial Analysis. Principles and Specific Applications</i>, 2nd edition., Blackwell Science, Oxford.</p> <p>Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code- Standard 3.2.2- Food Safety Practice and General requirements (Australia Only) https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2014C01204</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language is suitable however, grammar, sentence construction and shot typos, redundancy must be rectified to polish up the paper. Lastly, proofreading is needed to dismiss the weaknesses</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Tijoy Lowore
Department, University & Country	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resource, Malawi