

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_74572
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacteriological and Nutritional Quality of Irvingia Fruit Juice
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Results</p> <p>Authors present tables (1,2,3,4 and 5) without statistical parameters. But in the comment below, they cited ANOVA as statistical analysis and it showed differences. Observing results in tables, you cannot assess differences.</p> <p>Fig 1: Authors in the comment declare that "...it is indicated that only seven different bacteria isolates were obtained and successfully identified from the bacteriological analysis." If I understand well, this sentence means that they did not success in the identification of some other germs. Which are them and why? They may explain if possible.</p> <p>Table 5: The last sentence of the comment is a discussion. They should remove it in the appropriate section.</p> <p>Authors showed in the tables the different counts of bacteria. It should be good to show beside each type of bacteria the recommended standard.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Authors said that there was positive corelation between days of storage. This does not appear in the results. They should present in result section data of these analysis.</p> <p>Authors did say anywhere if the juice from day 0 to 28 is good for human consumption according to bacteria load.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Authors should always use the same word to indicate the juice. We have seen sometimes Irvingia Fruit Juice; Irvingia ganonensis Fruit Juice, Irvingia Fruit drink. It makes a confusion. They should also read again the manuscript to correct some mistakes.</p> <p>Method</p> <p>"A bacterial stock solution was prepared by transferring 1ml of the sample to a test tube containing 10ml of normal saline"; is it 1 ml to 9ml, right?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Authors should go to the essential.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Authors have done good research on the Irvingia Fruit Juice. In general, the manuscript is coherent, understandable.</p>	

[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>Kouassi Kouadio Benal</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Université Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire</i>