

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Biology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJOB_115973 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of the Microorganism Present in Garri Sold Within Local Market and Garri Producers in Ozoro Community |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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> | <p>Title: Suggest to change to “ Evaluation of the Microorganism contamination in “Garri” in Ozoro, Nigeria”</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> First sentence and second sentence are the same, please delete one. In method, please stated the type of study, date of data collection, sample size and how the samples taken, and what is the cut-ff for bacteria count and fungi count. Result of the fungi should be present in value. Any recommendation ? Suggest to check the proper keyword used. <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The article should be review for language Suggest to not too focus on Garri (one or two paragraphs should be enough). The author should highlighted the severity of the contamination of Garri in the country or other countries. Suggest to highlight the incident of food poisoning due to Garri contamination in the country or other countries. Last sentence should be the objective of the study. <p>Method:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest to summarise th content by highlighting important things such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type of study, sampling size, location of the study areas, how the samples collected and sent to which laboratory. Method of analysis should be summarised and just include the reference if the reader wanted further information regarding to analysis of samples. <p>Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest to write in the sentences about the findings of the study. Table 2, and 3 can be combine and the number of samples from each location should be highlighted. (If one sample taken from each location is not enough and not representative for that location). Table 4a and 4b not important. Statistical analysis should be done to compare the significant of findings from 3 localities. <p>Discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion should not have a Figure (should include in Result section) Bacteria count from Sample A, B C should not be due to sunlight factor alone. Please give a more valid reasons to support the discrepancies of bacteria counts. The investigators should also study the environmental factors which can contribute of the contaminations. For Fungi issues, the investigator should also study the environment sanitation factors to support the study | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Conclusion: 1. Suggest to highlighted the vending outlet in method section 2. The factory should also highlighted in this section 3. Recommendations suggested should be included in the study and not only taken samples. References: 1. Too few references to support this articles 2. Please check the abbreviation of the journal name | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The article should have review for language | |
| Optional/General comments | Thank you for asking me to review this paper, which is a cross-sectional study. The paper is generally not well written, and hard to follow. Suggested it to be rejected. | |

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: | Lim Kuang Kuay |
| Department, University & Country | National Institutes Of Health, Ministry Of Health, Malaysia |