

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_87450
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors contributing to unwholesome Food Processing and Preservation among Food Handlers in Port Harcourt, Nigeria
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.journalejnfs.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-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	<p>Review of the use of the terms “wholesome” and “unwholesome”. As proposed by the article, I believe that the best terms to use are “safe” and “unsafe” food processing.</p> <p>Review the issue of placing only one decimal place in the percentage values throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>Do not use the same words from the title as key words. I suggest including terms such as: “food safety”, “Food service”, “food borne diseases”, “good practices”.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Review the presentation format of tables 1, 2, 4 and 5. Follow the model in table 3.</p> <p>In table 2, when you present the answers “yes” and “no”, it is not necessary to put both options. Only yes or no is enough.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Do not bring the results in percentage values again in the discussion.</p>	<p>The terms safe and un safe food processing has been adopted for this study.</p> <p>All percentage values have been rounded off to one decimal place.</p> <p>Key words noted</p> <p>Tables are now presented in the right format</p> <p>The use of yes or no noted and corrected.</p>

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract:</p> <p>I suggest change: “of P < 0.05” to “p<0.05” I suggest “preservation practices as handlers who have been in the food business longer and those with larger scale food outlets tended to have better standards.”</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>I suggest “Food processing has enormous benefits which include: preservation,” I suggest “availability of many food items” I suggest “unsafe food causes 600 million cases”</p> <p>Materials and methods:</p> <p>I suggest “The study population comprised 365 apparently healthy food handlers in Obio/Akpor LGA of Rivers state.” I suggest “Multistage sampling method was used in the selection of the wards for the study in the local government. A total of 4 wards were selected and two (2) communities were randomly selected from each of the 4 wards,”</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>I suggest “food handlers (25.75%and 61.37% respectively)” I suggest “sometimes 40.55%) while” I suggest “use dark coloured oil (always 10.96% and sometimes 10.41%).” I suggest “score revealed that 47.40% of food handlers were associated with unwholesome food processing practices.” I suggest “Table 3 revealed that Mmore than half (63.56%)” Table 3: F - Frequency I suggest “food processing and preservation practices (p>0.05).” I suggest “businesses (58.38% smallscale, 31.21% medium and 10.40% large)” I suggest “Table 5- showed the food storage practices of the respondents”</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>I suggest “the age 40 years and below” I suggest “Abakiliki Nigeria, where 76.5% of” I suggest “small and medium scale” Standardize “et al.” I suggest “Nigeria by Adebukola et al. (9). In their” I suggest “Likewise, Otu and colleagues (22) recorded” I suggest “In the current study, despite 72.60% of food handlers undergoing regular food safety training, only 43.01% had” I suggest “handling practice (9,26,9,27,28).” I suggest “consumers and food handlers (28,29,30).” I suggest “thermal oxidation and this” I suggest “avoid spoilage during processing and improve palatability.” I suggest “Some of these additives pose a major risk to the consumers as a study conducted in Abakiliki, Nigeria by Ibiam et al. (33), on ‘Effect of Additives on fatty Acid profile in cooked Eggs’, showed a reduction in the nutritional quality and thus should be discouraged, while a study by Iweka (34),” I suggest “Ncube et al. (42) which recorded no statistical association between sex, educational status and hygiene practices, among food handlers (p=0.624 and p=0.362 respectively).” I suggest “Faremi et al. (30), attributed” I suggest “On the contrary, Ncube et al. (42) and Abdul-Mutalib et al. (29) reported a non-significant” I suggest “food processing and preservation practices, as small and medium scale</p>	<p>All suggestions have been noted and corrected. Thank you</p>
-------------------------	--	---

Review Form 1.6

	<p>businesses had an statistically significant association” I suggest “On the contrary Adebukola et al. (9), recorded no” I suggest “Their study agrees with the current study as the majority of the food handlers”</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>I suggest “practices in Obio-Akpor. There is need therefore for continuous training of food handlers on standard practices. Regulatory units should also increase the monitoring, supervisory and enforcement activities.”</p>	
Optional/General 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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p> <p>Written ethical clearance was obtained from the University of Port Harcourt Research Ethics Committee (UNIPORT REC) with an approval number (UPH/CEREMAD/REC/MM68/022)</p>	