

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_129696
Title of the Manuscript:	Adoption of hygienic meat production and handling practices among chevon and carabeef value chain stakeholders in Kerala, India
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>

**Review Form 3**

**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.	The study aimed to assess the adoption of hygienic meat production and handling practices among the players in the chevon and carabeef value chain. The methodology used scales developed by the researcher for the study, according to the procedure followed by George (1999), while the adoption of hygiene practices among retailers was studied using the scale developed by Greeshma (2023). The results showed that the majority of respondents had an average level of adoption of hygiene practices, both in individual categories and as a whole.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In order to comply with the precepts of the Declaration of Helsinki, the methodology of the manuscript needs to make it clear that the research was approved by a research ethics committee and that the participants accepted the conditions of the Informed Consent Form before starting the interviews.	

**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:	Tiago Rusin
Department, University & Country	Brazil