

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_121351
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing Food Safety in Africa: The Role of Molecular Biology Approaches
Type of the Article	Review paper

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript topic is interesting. However, a critical review and clear explanation of the gaps are necessary.. Furthermore, this manuscript has an overall similarity of 66%.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is quite general. The title could be more precise to highlight the originality of this paper. For instance, "Enhancing...: A review of current assessment, issues, and...".	
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.	This abstract should highlight any gaps or novelty that might contribute to the existing body of knowledge. I suggest to re-write of the abstract in order to enhance its clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure and subsections are suitable and consistent with the title.	
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's scientific accuracy is not particularly strong, as it only provides a summary. Even, knowledge gap is not properly explained particularly in relation to role of molecular biology approaches.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided were adequate.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article's English quality requires enhancement, and proofreading should be implemented prior to submission.	
Optional/General comments	The author should review the paper once more as there are several repetitive sentences.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nadiatul Syima Mohd Shahid
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia