SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPR_63355**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessment of the safety of 'suya' condiment vended in three communities in Rivers State, Nigeria.**
Type of the Article	**Research**

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)

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	- **The aim is not well presented.** - **The problem must be improved** - **The sample collections must be describe** - **Provide the justification of the sample size.** - **Lake of statistical analyse**	1. The aim was explicitly presented. 2. 'leading to food spoilage and foodborne illnesses' added to emphasize the problem. 3. Described 4. This sample size was based on the area of study and preliminary work. 5. Statistical analysis reflected in the work.
Minor REVISION comments	- Improve the discussion section - Follow the instruction of authors for the references.	1. There is paucity of reports in this area for more elaborate comparism. 2. We have gone through the reference section and could not spot the deviation from the specification for this Journal. The observed typographical error corrected and highlighted yellow. Please, note that majority of the referenced articles have no digital object identifier.
Optional/General comments	**The manuscript untitled** Assessment of the safety of 'suya' condiment vended in three communities in Rivers State, Nigeria is an interesting subject. The authors follow the scientific rules. The presented results are in link with the used methodology. However, there is some corrections to be done.	I wished reviewer was specific on the corrections needed.

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)*	