

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_126089
Title of the Manuscript:	How Bacteria Cause Food Contamination?
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing issue of foodborne illnesses caused by microbial contamination. It thoroughly reviews the various pathways through which bacteria can enter the food supply, emphasizing the importance of hygiene and proper food handling practices. The detailed examination of causative agents like Salmonella and E. coli, alongside practical prevention strategies, contributes valuable insights that can inform public health policies and educational programs aimed at reducing foodborne diseases. However, I find the manuscript lacks clarity and cohesion in its presentation. The extensive list of bacteria and their sources, while informative, could overwhelm readers without a clear synthesis of how these factors interconnect. Additionally, the repetitive nature of certain sections detracts from the overall impact, making it less engaging. A more structured approach with clearer connections between points could enhance its effectiveness in conveying essential food safety practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "How Bacteria Cause Food Contamination?" may not be the best fit for a review article, as it suggests a focus primarily on the mechanisms by which bacteria lead to contamination, rather than a comprehensive overview of the subject. A more suitable title could be "Bacterial Contamination in Food: Sources, Risks, and Prevention Strategies." This title reflects the broader scope of the article, which includes not only the bacteria involved but also their sources, the risks they pose, and prevention methods.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the aims and discussions related to microbial contamination of food. However, it could benefit from some refinements to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness. Here are my suggestions: The aim statement could be rephrased for clarity. Stating key prevention strategies (such as proper food handling practices or specific interventions) would strengthen the abstract. Adding a sentence about the implications of understanding microbial contamination for public health or food safety regulations could give the abstract more weight and context. Ensure consistency in the naming of bacteria (e.g., "Escherichia coli" should be italicized consistently). Additionally, check the spelling of "Eschericia coli" in the abstract, as it should be "Escherichia coli."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To enhance clarity, consider adding a brief overview of each section in the introduction and summarizing key points at the end of major sections. Including tables or figures to visualize data or summarize information could also improve comprehension.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents a comprehensive review of microbial contamination in food and its implications for public health, particularly among vulnerable populations. It is scientifically robust due to its thorough examination of well-documented bacterial pathogens, including their sources and mechanisms of contamination. The discussion of the FATTOM mnemonic effectively highlights critical factors influencing bacterial growth, providing a clear framework for understanding food safety. Additionally, the inclusion of recent studies and data strengthens the manuscript's credibility, as it aligns with current research on foodborne illnesses and preventive measures. Overall, the manuscript is technically sound and contributes valuable insights into mitigating foodborne health risks.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	While the article is suitable for scholarly communication, it would benefit from revisions to improve grammatical accuracy, clarity, organization, and critical engagement with the material.	
Optional/General comments	Can you define specific terms used in the manuscript, such as "opportunistic organisms"?	

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:	Mohammad Hasan Chowdhury
Department, University & Country	St. Francis College, USA