

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_76565
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF MICROBIOLOGICAL QUALITY ASSOCIATED WITH READY- TO- EAT BUSH MEAT SOLD AT RUMUOKORO MARKET IN RIVERS STATE
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This is a subject that is linked to the hygienic quality of two categories of bush meats, an important subject that could affect the public health.	
Minor REVISION comments	The revision has been carried out with corrections marked in red (here attached the manuscript). The remarks are as follows: -The manuscript is clear, well structured, and methodical. Technically, the authors must mention the culture media used for the isolation of <i>Staphylococcus</i> , <i>Pseudomonas</i> , and <i>Pseudomonas</i> species. - According to the manuscript, the authors reported the analysis of 12 samples for each product, but the results have been expressed as an average, and so we cannot refer to the regulations, nor know the number or percentage of too contaminated samples of those less contaminated (Table 1 and Table 2), is not it? - For this, on what regulatory basis, the authors judged the hygienic quality of analyzed products? - it is better to insert the statistical analysis results in table 1. -Two propositions are given in the text (marked in red and between two brackets) of the manuscript must be justified. - Author guidelines requirements (references) were followed Good luck	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	<i>Elhassan Benyagoub</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Bechar, Algeria</i>