

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_83446
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional composition, microbial load of some pre-packaged snacks and safety compliance of informal foodservice operators in Oyo State
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:

(<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-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		
Minor REVISION comments	Needs minor revision	
Optional/General comments	<p>Reviewer's comment The authors should effect the following corrections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Energy value (This was calculated by multiplying the values of crude protein, crude fat, and carbohydrate by factors of 4, 9 and 4, respectively. The sum of their product was expressed in kilocalories. Energy value (Kcal)=(Carbohydrate×4)+ (Protein×4) +(Crude fat×9). <i>I believe the factors used in the multiplication was not just chosen by the authors at random, please state the source as a reference.</i> ii. You can start a sentence with number e.g 10g. instead use Ten grams (10g) iii. In Table 3 and in the main write-up the author used the abbreviation FSO without stating the full meaning. Pleas writ it in full for the first time in the main work and do same in the Table. iv. 'SON (Standard Organisation of Nigeria)' <i>Please write in full before abbreviating it e.g Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON).</i> v. '. The required standard should be between 10-25 of which <i>dodo Ikire</i> was the only product that exceed this standard' <i>please recast and be specific what you are referring to whether to the ash content or the fat content., be cross check the figures used '10-25' and state the unit e.g 10-25%</i> vi. The fat and ash content of coconut chips reported by Manikantan (2016) was higher than the value obtained in this study However, according to Sajilata <i>et al.</i> (2002) higher fat content within a certain limit makes digestibility difficult and causes rancidity in stored foods. The required standard should be between 10-25 of which <i>dodo Ikire</i> was the only product that exceed this standard value.<i>where did this figures 10-25 come from. It is not shown in any table or figure.</i> Except for cracker biscuit and coconut chips other crude fibre content were significantly low when compared with the required standard for pre-packaged foods of less than 5%. <i>How did the 5% come about?</i> vii. From table 3, the authors did not discuss the differences observed between the different LGA and differences between the products from the urban area and 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>rural area.</p> <p>viii. What is the full meaning of NIS. <i>Please write it in full</i></p> <p>ix. <i>Please write in full FSO in all the tables where it appears</i></p> <p>x. “The total plate count for Dodo Ikire from two different LGA (Oluyole and Ibadan Northeast) <u>was significantly different throughout the period of the experiment with higher values</u> (2.95 x 10³ and 2.90 x 10³ cfu/g) recorded after 72 h”. <i>This values are not the highest in the table, what is the interest about it here.</i></p> <p>xi. “The total plate count of Potato chip was 1.20 x 10¹ cfu/g and 1.25 x 10¹ cfu/g (Ibadan Northeast and Kajola LGA) for the first 24 h. After 48 h of incubation, the total plate count of Potato chip increased to 2.30 x10² cfu/g and 2.50 x 10² cfu/g. The 72h total plate count of Potato chip was 3.15 x 10³ cfu/g and 3.20 x 10³ cfu/g respectively.” <i>There is no need lifting every figures of Potatto chip and writing them down. Write only important ones. Same goes for Biscuits</i></p> <p>xii. <i>Table 5 have no title</i></p> <p>xiii. <i>From section “3.3 The activities of food health inspectors (FHI) on the operation of the informal foodservice system.” The results and discussion is confusing. Table seems to be out of place. Figures just came up without reference to any source either in the form of table or figure. I suppose the authors were quoting figures from the questionnaires without presentation of the summary of their questionnaire presented.</i></p> <p>xiv. Kasapila W, Shawa P. (2011): Use and understanding of nutrition labels among consumers in Lilongwe, Malawi. African Journal of food Agriculture Nutritional Development 11(5): 5171-5186. <i>Is this a single author or two? Because it is showing two authors in the main manuscript but one in the reference section. Correct appropriately</i></p> <p>xv. <i>The reference “Olatona” is 2020 in the main work while it is 2019 in the reference. Correct please</i></p> <p>xvi. <i>Similarly the reference “Osundahunsi and Aworh, 1998” in the main work and “Osundahunsi, O. F., and Aworh, O. C. (2003)” in the reference section</i></p> <p>xvii. <i>The reference “Otemuyiwa and Adewusi, 2013” in the main work and “Otemuyiwa, I. O., and Adewusi, S. R. (2014).” in the reference section</i></p> <p>xviii. <i>The following reerences cited in the main body of the paper are not in the reference section. A) Taiwo et al., 2021. b) Andarwulan et al., 2011. c) Fawole, 1986. d) Kolawole et al., 2020. e) Manikantan (2016). f) Sajilata et al. (2002). g) Brown (1991) and h) Osagbemi et al. (2010)</i></p> <p>xix. <i>The author should be constant with the position of titles in the tables and figures. If it is below the tables it should be the throughout the entire work</i></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:	Ogbebor O. Nicholas
Department, University & Country	Rubber Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria