

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_87579
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation, identification and mode of action of partially purified bacteriocins from lactic acid bacteria in fermented cassava grits.
Type of the Article	Manuscript

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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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	<p>Comment on abstract, title, références</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Somehow the aim of manuscript is clear, and the study findings are clear• The title is informative• Abstract should not contain anything about materials and methods• The references are relevant to the topic of the manuscript, and I think the author able to find modern references instead of the old once. References were listed and put in inappropriate manner. <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The introduction is clear and covered the topic of the study• Some phrases need reference• More clarification (You should provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution) <p>## Comment on methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I think the methods section is reorganized, it was conducted in good way, methods of the study are reliable, Somehow, there is few missing details need to be complete.• Statistical analysis was not used? <p>## Comments on data and results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The researcher presented the data in an appropriate way, tables and figures are relevant and clearly presented, appropriate unites. Titles, columns, and rows labelled correctly and clearly.• I wonder, why there are no control growth group (Free of PPB) for all the foodborne bacteria to compare it with the inhibited ones counts. <p>## Comments on discussion and conclusions</p> <p>I think the result needs to be discussed in good manner and more explanation for the obtained results, and the conclusion needs more attention.</p>	<p>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</p> <p>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</p> <p>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</p>
Optional/General comments		

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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	