

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_121784
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE PREVALENCE OF SALMONELLOSIS AMONG UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS IN OWERRI METROPOLIS, NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>It provides valuable insights into the prevalence and distribution of Salmonella infections among a specific population-undergraduate students in Owerri, Nigeria. The study highlights significant differences in infection rates based on gender and age, offering a nuanced understanding of how these factors influence susceptibility to Salmonella. I appreciate the manuscript for its contribution to public health knowledge particularly in emphasizing the need for targeted hygiene education and preventive measures among younger students. However, I would have liked to see a more extensive sample size and the inclusion of molecular identification techniques, which could have strengthened the findings and provided deeper insights into the epidemiology of Salmonella in the particular region.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes. No change needed.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its systematic approach in assessing the prevalence of Salmonella infections among undergraduate students. The use of culture methods on Salmonella and Shigella agar to isolate and identify specific Salmonella species is a standard and reliable microbiological technique. The study also provides clear and detailed statistical data, breaking down the prevalence of gender, age and year of study which enhances the credibility and thoroughness of the analysis. Additionally, the comparison of findings with previous studies adds depth to the discussion and helps validate the observed trends, making the manuscript a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>While the manuscript presents valuable data on the prevalence of Salmonella infections among UG students, it falls short in several areas, rendering it less suitable for publications in its current form. The sample size of the study is very small which limits the generalizability of the findings and raise concerns about the statistical power of the results. Additionally the reliance solely on culture methods without incorporating more advanced molecular identification techniques weakness the robustness of the conclusions drawn. The manuscript also lacks a detailed exploration of potential confounding factors such as socioeconomic status and environmental conditions which could significantly influence infection rates. These limitations suggest that further refinement and additional research are needed before the manuscript can be considered for possible publications.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	S. Umamaheswari
Department, University & Country	Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, India