

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_122202
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Non-Typhoidal Salmonella species in Food and Stool samples in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
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)
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will help inform the scientific researchers on the trend of the non-typhoidal infections and probably assist in assessing the effectiveness of the mitigation measures put in place. 2. From the data obtained in this manuscript, it will help scientists put emphasis on the preventive measures against the transmission of the nontyphoidal disease for example emphasize on why the street food should be avoided and the need to educate the food vendors on the importance of hygienic practices when handling food. 3. It is implying that, the management strategy should sensitize people in order to help them understand the transmission modes and inform of the ways that can help reduce infection to non-typhoidal Salmonella. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I am pleased with the title. It is suitable.	
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 is adequate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate. May be the author(s) could indicate whether there are any competing interests.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript has been formatted with an abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion and references. 2. The referencing is enough proof that the authors did enough research before coming up with the entire manuscript. 3. The data obtained is reliable by the society and also by the scientific community. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	A lot of studies on non-typhoidal Salmonella have been done in the recent years and I therefore suggest the author(s) use more recent references/citations. May be studies published in the years (2014 – 2024).	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is suitable and clear for easy understanding by the scientific community	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For easy review, I recommend the inclusion of line numbers in the entire manuscript and also page numbers. 2. Include a link/URL for where the map can be found in the internet 3. Avoid repetition of the results in the discussion section. 	

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:	Schola Kamwethya Peter
Department, University & Country	Kenya Medical Research Institute, Kenya