

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_86788
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Bacterial contaminants and nutritional profiles of Mung bean Sprouts ( <i>Vigna radiate</i> L)
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:

(<https://www.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The studied subject is interesting and corresponds to the objectives and scope of the SAJRM journal which aimed to search for microbial contaminants and the nutritional quality of Mung bean Sprouts.</p> <p>The remarks are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- for the summary part, please restructure this part by adding to the introduction, methods previously cited, the main obtained results, and finally, a small conclusion OK!</li> <li>- For the method part, in particular the nutritional value assessment, please mention the methods used to measure each parameter studied. Also, it should be mentioned that these analyzes were carried out on the fresh and dried part of the Mung bean sprout.</li> <li>-Please correct the name of some antibiotics used : Meropenum (MEM) <b>Meropenem</b> (MEM); Nalidix acid (NA) <b>Nalidixic acid (NA)</b></li> <li>-the authors talk about the analysis of 17 batches. However, the presented results do not suggest the analysis of this number of batches, nor the statistical analysis</li> <li>-for the results part, when I consulted the figures of isolated species, I noticed that these figures are imported from websites (Fig. 4; Fig. 5; Fig. 6 and Fig. 7), and therefore, the authors are not the owners of these figures, so I recommend replacing them with figures taken by the authors themselves. Otherwise, this may be considered plagiarism.</li> <li>-the results given in figures 11 and 12, can be inserted in table 4. This table could be formatted into a landscape page instead of a portrait page just to make the table clearer</li> <li>- Please insert vitamin C value for dry Sprouts (Table 6).</li> <li>-Please, I recommend comparing your results with other works because two references and two others as a website are truly insufficient. In addition, for the whole manuscript, three references and four others as websites certainly decrease the scientific value of the article in terms of comparison. For that, I recommend the authors to reference more published articles.</li> <li>-An effort should be made to improve the text, especially in the grammatical matters (Manuscript need to be improved)</li> <li>-Author guidelines requirements must be followed (references).</li> </ul> <p>Good Luck</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Elhassan Benyagoub</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mohammed Tahri University of Bechar, Algeria</b>