

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_124804
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological Quality of Raw Cow's Milk Produced and Marketed in the Town of Bongor, Chad
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>The manuscript "Microbiological Quality of Raw Cow's Milk Produced and Marketed" is crucial for the scientific community as it addresses significant public health concerns related to food safety. By evaluating the microbiological quality of raw milk, the study contributes to our understanding of potential pathogens and contaminants that can affect consumer health. This research can inform regulatory policies and best practices in dairy production, ultimately aiming to enhance food safety standards.</p> <p>Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its practical implications and relevance to both consumers and producers. It sheds light on an often-overlooked aspect of dairy safety and emphasizes the need for ongoing monitoring and improvement in raw milk quality. Such studies are essential for promoting informed choices and ensuring public health.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes but its need some modification Microbiological Quality of Raw Cow's Milk Produced and Marketed change this word by (Marketing system)</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>of course its comprehensive but please try to add study design and study area in the background part</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>of course</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 demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its comprehensive analysis of microbiological contaminants in raw cow's milk. The systematic approach to sampling and testing, along with the detailed presentation of mean and extreme values, provides a clear picture of the contamination levels present in the samples. The consistent findings, such as the high average levels of total aerobic mesophilic flora (TAMF) and Staphylococcus aureus, highlight serious public health concerns and underscore the need for effective monitoring. Moreover, the absence of Salmonella and acceptable loads of Bacillus cereus indicate a thorough evaluation of relevant pathogens. The use of appropriate statistical measures further enhances the credibility of the results, allowing for meaningful interpretations and conclusions. Overall, the manuscript is well-structured and contributes valuable insights into the microbiological quality of raw milk, making it a significant addition to the literature on food safety.</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>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Here are some observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Terminology Consistency: The manuscript uses specific microbiological terms appropriately, which is crucial for scientific discourse. However, consistency in the use of terms (e.g., "Milking" vs. "milking") should be maintained throughout the text.◆ Clarity and Flow: Some sentences are quite complex and could be simplified for better readability. Breaking long sentences into shorter ones can enhance clarity.◆ Grammar and Syntax: There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrases that may hinder comprehension. For example, phrases like "total absence of Salmonella was observed" could be rephrased for smoother reading.◆ Citations and References: The use of citations is appropriate, but ensure that all references follow a consistent format. Clear attribution to previous studies strengthens the manuscript's credibility.◆ Technical Precision: While the technical content is robust, ensuring that all measurements and results are presented clearly (e.g., using consistent formatting for CFU/ml) will improve the overall quality. <p>Overall, with some revisions for grammar, clarity, and consistency, the manuscript can effectively communicate its findings to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here are some general comments on the provided text:</p> <p>Clarity and Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Overall Clarity: The text conveys important findings regarding the microbiological quality of raw milk. However, some sentences are lengthy and complex, which may hinder readability. Breaking them into shorter, more concise sentences could improve clarity.◆ Logical Flow: The progression from one topic to another is generally smooth, but clearer transitions between sections could help guide the reader more effectively. For instance, introducing each parameter with a brief rationale for its importance might enhance the structure. <p>Scientific Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Data Presentation: The manuscript effectively presents key data and comparisons with other studies, which strengthens its validity. However, using consistent formatting for numerical values (e.g., CFU/ml) throughout the text will enhance professionalism.◆ Citations: The use of citations adds credibility, but ensure that all references are formatted consistently according to the chosen citation style. This will help readers locate the original studies more easily.◆ Hypotheses and Explanations: The text successfully presents hypotheses to explain contamination sources, which adds depth to the analysis. However, these sections could benefit from more explicit connections between findings and proposed explanations.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with the 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 detail)</i> no	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Solomon Musema Mussa
Department, University & Country	Werabe University, Ethiopia