

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_111178
Title of the Manuscript:	Perception of the vegetable microbial contamination risk in the market gardening environment of Niamey (Niger)
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In my opinion, it is important because it can be used for additional references, especially regarding similar research 2. I think the appropriate title for this manuscript is analysis of risk factors for microbial contamination of vegetables in market gardening environments in Niamey (Niger) 3. The abstract is incomplete or does not describe the contents of the manuscript as a whole because it does not include the number of samples, sampling techniques, research instruments, research methods, research variables, data processing analysis. Too many keywords used, maximum 5 words, minimum 3 words. examples Vegetable, Contamination, Microbiological Market, garden 4. Results and discussion are not related to each other. In the discussion, vegetable cultivation practices that were at risk of biocontamination were discussed, but the results were not written down. written results: Risk factors for microbiological contamination related to market gardening practices but not discussed. The subtitles in the discussion should be the same as the subtitles in the results, so that readers are not confused. 5. Improvements still need to be made, especially in the results and discussion sections. The author also has not explained the sampling technique used and the research instruments used. whether using a questionnaire, or using an observation sheet or using other tools 6. The article references used are sufficient but the latest references are not used because there are still article references from the old year, namely 2003. Good references are from the last ten years. 7. Article Type is original research paper but word count is more than 6000 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	English articles are suitable for scientific communication	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fiqi Nurbaya
Department, University & Country	Veteran Bangunnusantara University, Indonesia