

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Food Science Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AFSJ_110087 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Prevalence of common microbiological pathogen contamination in processed milk and milk products in Nairobi County |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. Yes, this study is of interest to the scientific community. Even though the author cited numerous previous studies which relate to the subject, this study, although preliminary, serves as a reminder of how milk and dairy products are sensitive to microbiological contamination and must therefore be handled in hygienic conditions.</p> <p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Yes, however the discussion section should be merged, not split into 5.1, 5.2 etc.</p> <p>4. No, Errors were made in the analysis of the samples, notably in the definition of the 10-1 dilution. Which calls into question the microbial loads of the samples. Therefore, I would like to invite the author(s) to verify all of this and to specify the references of the method used. Also, I would like to invite the author(s) to really make an effort in the interpretation of the results and the discussion to make it more coherent.</p> <p>5. Yes, the authors cited around twenty-two references between the years 1998 and 2021, with most dating back 10 years or less. However, they were not rigorous in the citations. Seven out of eight citations in the text are not listed in references section. Similarly, some references listed in references section are not cited in the text.</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>Noted</p> |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The English language must be thoroughly rechecked for grammar, style and wording.</p> | <p>Ok done</p> |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | | |

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> | |