

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_113988
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional Quality and Presence of Escherichia coli in Selected Vended Sachet Yoghurts in Obio/Akpor, Rivers State, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	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, the manuscript provides information on the mineral composition and microbial quality of yoghurt sold in the study area</p> <p>No, as the authors have analysed only four minerals but they are claiming nutritional quality therefore it may be given a suitable title</p> <p>No the authors should include details of virulence gene targeted</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Questionable</p> <p>Yes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors have analysed only four minerals but the title of the article says nutritional quality which I feel is not appropriate 2. A brief description of the virulence genes targeted should be given in the abstract. The Brand names of the products analysed should be avoided. 3. In sections 2.2 the authors have not mentioned properly the details of the method used for analysis of various minerals like the quantity of sample analysed and wavelength details. Also method employed by the author differs from the reference cited. Further details should be given. 4. There are spelling mistakes even in the media used for analysis like "Eocene methylene" which is not acceptable. 5. In section 2.4 the authors have given a reference but the protocol employed like the media used here differs from the reference cited hence suitable reference must be included to justify the use of EMB agar and the temperature of incubation. 6. In section 2.6, the authors have given details of virulence genes targeted but the gene name itself is not given properly. Also the gene targeted are commonly used for identification of EAEC, EPEC and EHEC details of which are not mentioned in the manuscript. In addition, the composition of the PCR reaction mixture is not proper as the volume is not adding up and the concentration of primers used is not given properly. 7. In section 2.7 the method employed for the ABST is not clear 8. In result and discussion the language may be improved and rewritten in many places. 9. In section 3.4 the details of standards followed to classify the isolates as sensitive or resistant is not clearly mentioned. 10. The authors have mentioned only two sample carried E. coli but in ABST testing there are a total of 10 isolates tested hence details of how these isolates obtained may be given. 11. The supporting images of PCR carried out and ABST testing are not given by the author. The appropriate positive controls for standardization of PCR assays is not mentioned. <p>Hence based on the above comments I find the research article needs major revisions and it cannot be accepted in its present form.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Needs improvement including spelling mistakes and improper name of genes targeted was noticed in the article</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Based on the above comments I find the research article needs serious major revisions and it cannot be accepted in its present form	
----------------------------------	---	--

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sreedhara J.N.
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India