

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_128002
Title of the Manuscript:	“Global Perspectives on Food Safety and Quality Control Standards: A Comprehensive Review”
Type of the Article	Review 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 (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript entitled <i>Global Perspectives on Food Safety and Quality Control Standards: A Comprehensive Review</i> is of significant importance to the scientific community as it offers an in-depth analysis of food safety and quality control systems across different regions. By highlighting the challenges, regulatory frameworks, and best practices, it provides a comprehensive understanding of the global efforts to ensure food safety. This review is crucial for policymakers, researchers, and industry professionals looking to harmonize standards and improve the quality and safety of food products. It also serves as a valuable resource for future studies aiming to address emerging food safety concerns in a globalized market.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "<i>Global Perspectives on Food Safety and Quality Control Standards: A Comprehensive Review</i>" is highly suitable for the manuscript as it clearly conveys the central themes of the work. It accurately reflects the broad scope of the review, emphasizing the global context of food safety and quality control standards. The use of "comprehensive review" indicates that the manuscript offers an in-depth analysis, providing a well-rounded understanding of the subject matter. This makes the title informative and aligned with the content, helping potential readers understand the focus of the paper immediately.</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>The abstract you provided does not fully follow the IMRAD (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) format, which is commonly used for scientific papers. Here's a breakdown of how it aligns with or diverges from the IMRAD structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction: The abstract starts with a general introduction to the topic of food safety and quality control standards, presenting the significance of the subject. This aligns with the <i>Introduction</i> section of the IMRAD format. Methods: The abstract briefly mentions key methodologies like Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) and Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP), but it doesn't provide detailed descriptions of how these methods were applied or analyzed in the review. A more specific explanation of the methods used to gather or analyze information would strengthen this section to align more closely with the IMRAD format. Results: The abstract lacks specific results or findings from the review itself. Instead of presenting new data or outcomes, it describes various aspects of food safety systems. A results section in a typical IMRAD format would provide measurable outcomes or findings, which this abstract does not. Discussion: The abstract does include a discussion of the challenges, including globalization and technological advancements, and addresses potential solutions to improve food safety. It concludes with a broader reflection on the importance of food safety and quality control, which is in line with the <i>Discussion</i> section of the IMRAD format. <p>Conclusion: While the abstract includes some elements of the IMRAD structure, such as an introduction and a discussion, it lacks clear results and a more detailed methods section. To fully follow the IMRAD format, the abstract should provide a clearer description of the methods used for reviewing the topic and present specific findings or results derived from the review.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript title "<i>Global Perspectives on Food Safety and Quality Control Standards: A Comprehensive Review</i>" is scientifically correct. The title accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. It clearly indicates that the article provides a broad overview of food safety and quality control standards from a global perspective. The phrase "Comprehensive Review" suggests that the manuscript offers an in-depth analysis of existing literature and practices, which aligns with the expectations of scientific reviews. Furthermore, the inclusion of key terms like "food safety," "quality control standards," and "global perspectives" ensures the title is relevant and appropriately descriptive for a scientific audience.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the article are both sufficient and recent, effectively supporting the key points discussed throughout the manuscript. The inclusion of a broad range of sources ensures a comprehensive understanding of the topic, while the use of up-to-date references demonstrates the authors' engagement with current research and developments in the field. This combination of breadth and timeliness adds credibility and relevance to the article, making it a valuable resource for readers interested in the latest advancements in food safety and quality control standards.</p>	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and overall English quality of the article are highly suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and effectively conveys complex concepts in a manner that is accessible to an academic audience. The use of appropriate technical terminology and well-structured sentences enhances the readability and professionalism of the manuscript, ensuring it meets the standards expected in scholarly publications. Overall, the article is well-written and maintains a formal tone appropriate for the scientific community."	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zakiah Samori
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Mara (UiTM) Shah Alam, Malaysia