

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Biotechnology Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJI_128666
Title of the Manuscript:	Operator's hygiene practices and microbial contamination of liquid gapal sold in Ouagadougou
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Food safety is key to reduce both morbidity and mortality rate	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable, however I suggest if the author can add the word " city in Burkinafaso as shown below Operator's hygiene practices and microbial contamination of liquid gapal sold in Ouagadougou city in Burkinafaso.	
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>The manuscript is scientifically okay, but isuggest if the author can gibe a brief senteces on the study area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Study design needs to be mentioned is for instance cross sectional study. How were the 33 water samples collected, was it purposive, random etc? This need to be mentoned. .In the second las sentence in section 2.1 Liquid gapal sampling Where the sentence reads "analyzed within 24 hours for Total Aerobic Mesophilic microorganisms" what did the aauthor mean? Are the <i>Enterobacteriaceae, yeast mould one of the examples of Total aerobic mesophic microorganisms?</i> The lab method used to analyse the micro orgamism needs to be mentioned in the methodology e.g pour plate technique. Direct plating method etc <p>Discussion</p> <p>In the discussion section line sentece (4-6) reads "All producers pasteurize milk (liquid or powder) but the survey revealed that time/temperature schedules are not perfectly mastered" <i>Can the author iclude the results to back up the above sentece. Since there are no results that showed that from all the tables and graphs that were used.</i></p> <p>The sentence belew in the discussion "It is higher than the values obtained in 2017 from gapal sellers in the same town, which was $8.5 \cdot 10^8$ cfu/ml or $8.9 \log_{10}$ cfu/ml" needs to be citated and refenced. (To mention who did this study).</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>-I suggest the references to be arranged alphabetically. E.g the first reference starts with V, this should be listed last. -Reference number 5 and 21 are the same as shown below</p> <p>5. F. Hama, A. Savadogo, C. A. T. Ouattara, & A. S. Traore (2009). Biochemical, Microbial and Processing Study of Degue a Fermented Food From Pearl millet dough) from Burkina Faso. Pakistan J. Nutr., 8(6), 759–764. doi: 10.3923/pjn.2009.759.764.</p> <p>21. F. Hama, A. Savadogo, C. A. T. Ouattara, & A. S. Traore (2009)., “Biochemical, Microbial and Processing Study of Dèguè a Fermented Food (From Pearl millet dough) from Burkina Faso,” Pakistan J. Nutr., vol. 8 (6), 759–764.</p> <p>-Update the reference to the most current especially on the article journals to at least less than equal to 5 years. Some are too old e.g</p> <p>Rerence number 4 of 2017</p> <p>Rerence number 5 of 2009</p> <p>Rerence number 8 of 2015</p> <p>Rerence number 9 of 2014</p> <p>Rerence number 19 of 2014</p> <p>Rerence number 22 of 2014</p> <p>Rerence number 24 of 2016</p> <p>Rerence number 27 of 2011</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is okay.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Bibi Abdallah Bakari</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Kenya</p>