SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_56364**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EFFET OF LACTIC ACID ON INACTIVATION OF ENTEROTOXIGENIC ESCHERICHIA COLI (ETEC) ISOLATED FROM TUNA LOINS PRODUCED IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE**
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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 manuscript is very interesting and could be of good impact for industry in the TUNA field. However, he results needs more details.** **1) In the results section, the technical replicates and basic statistical analysis are missed (like standard deviation). Please provide the technical replicates (at least 3 replicates) for all the experiments.** **Additionally, I would like to see an untreated control (using the same dilution vehicle that you used to dilute lactic acid -as 18.2 water or DMSO) also, for all experiments, for comparative analysis.**	I agree with reviewer. We made the correction in the manuscript
Minor REVISION comments	1) Last paragraph of introduction: please add principal findings after you mention the aim of the study. 2) Please abbreviate *Escherichia coli* to *E. coli* after the first mention. 3) sub-section 2.2 of material and methods: in any case you used agitation to grow the bacteria? 4) Ln-3 of results: *E. coli* was not in italic, please review it in all the manuscript. 5) Please get together figures 1-4 (as new figure 1a, b, c, d), and 5-8 (as new figure 2 a, b, c,d). This will be great for interpretation of the data by the reader. Just figure 9 is better alone.	I agree with reviewer. We made the correction in the manuscript
Optional/General comments	**To discuss: in conclusion, you mentioned the usage of more then 1% of lactic acid to prevent contamination. The pH of 2 and 3% is permitted by food regulatory agences**? Maybe you can test 1.5% and the pH is less acid, but bactericidal.	

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)*	No