SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJNFS_67309**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Microbiological Quality and Safety of fruits and vegetables from open market and shopping complex in Port Harcourt Metropolis**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI 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	It is a simple article but it is interesting because one of the objectives is to provide basic information about the microbial counts of some vegetables, in my opinion it can be published but some points need to be better explained. 1. It is not clear how much sample was used to determine the pH and total titratable acidity. The authors have to explain the sample preparation of each vegetable to determine the titratable acidity and pH. 2. Is % lactic acid fresh weight or dry weight? It is not clear. 3. It is strange that the acidity of the lettuce was so high, more than that of the tomato, how can you explain it? There is no reference to this question in the discussion. 4. The second objective of the document is to compare the acidity and microbiological quality and safety of some fruits and vegetables that are sold in the open market and in a shopping complex in the metropolis of Port Harcourt. In the discussion there is no reference to the relationship between the acidity and the pH of the different vegetables and the count of the different types of microbes, nor to the classification between "high acid" and "low acid foods", for example tomatoes *versus* cabbages or lettuces, they should dig a little deeper into this aspect.	**1.** The method of preparation of the samples for pH determination has been included. **Briefly, 2 g of each sample was macerated with 20 ml of sterile distilled water, allowed to stand for 2 min before filtering into a beaker.** 2. Lactic acid in this case is not dry weight as fresh samples were macerated and filtered. 3. The higher values may be attributed to the presence of other organic acids such as citric, oxalic acid in lettuce. Lettuce has been reported to be rich in citric and oxalic acids. Other factors that may be responsible include variety and production conditions (Brecht et al 2010). These have also been included in the discussion. 4. The objective was not comparing between the acidity and microbial counts as in the relationship between them but comparing the acidty of the samples from the open market with that of the shopping mall and comparing the microbial count of the open market and the shopping mall. Acidity plays its role in microbial growth so those temperature. The two sample areas presented different environments the microbial count may not be a direct effect of acidity alone but of a hurdle effect. This is why the study didn't relate acidty and the microbical count. However, a paragraph have been included to highlight that aspect.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	None