

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_118621
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBIOGRAM AND BACTERIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF RAW MEAT SOLD IN OWERRI, SOUTHEAST NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	

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>1. Yes, this article is important for the scientific community as it addresses the microbiological quality of raw meat sold in Owerri, Nigeria. This information is useful for understanding the public health risks associated with the consumption of raw meat and can help develop better handling strategies.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title "ANTIBIOGRAM AND BACTERIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF RAW MEAT SOLD IN OWERRI, SOUTHEAST NIGERIA" is quite appropriate and reflects the content of the article.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of this article is sufficiently comprehensive. It covers the purpose, methods, key results, and conclusions of the study.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure of the manuscript is generally well-organized, with sections on Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion.</p> <p>5. Overall, this manuscript appears to be scientifically sound. The research methodology is described in sufficient detail, the results are presented with adequate quantitative data, and the discussion links the findings to relevant literature.</p> <p>6. The references used in this article are relatively up-to-date, with the majority of the references coming from the last 10 years. However, some more recent references may further strengthen the literature review.</p> <p>Additional suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The article can be strengthened by a more in-depth discussion on the implications of the findings for food safety and public health. - The addition of trend analysis or comparison of results with previous studies in the same region could add value to this article. - Practical recommendations for meat sellers and policymakers can also be considered to complement the article. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the quality of the English language in this review is adequate for scientific communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this article is quite good and provides a useful contribution to the understanding of the microbiological quality of raw meat in Owerri, Nigeria. With some minor revisions, such as the additional suggestions provided above, this article can be further strengthened</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Masudin Sangaji
Department, University & Country	Pattimura University, Indonesia