SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Microbiology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMB_57377**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Hygienic conditions and quality of the dishes cooked by the women traders in the town of Korhogo.**
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 Study is useful however the sample size and survey time limits could have been enhanced. The data presentation needs to be improved by merging the tables with similar titles. Small Grammatical and spelling errors should be removed	Your comments are relevant to the sample size, but for the timeframe of the survey, we were wrong. We conducted the survey from November 2018 to February 2019. We have also improved the presentation of the data by merging some tables with similar titles.
Minor REVISION comments	a) Abstract: Well written and precise. Keywords could be improved. b) Line 26 : can eliminate the usage of urban word twice c) Line 44: Receiving/ received? d) Line 45; Correct the grammar , adds to e) Line 49 : include to f) Sub heading 2.3 is missing, Use same format for subheading 2.3 or your 2.4 g) Line 111 : % is missing h) Line 249 : Use the right word with proper meaning i) Merge Tables 1,2,3 j) Merge Tables 4,5,6 k) Merge Tables 8,9,10,11 l) Merge Tables 12,13,14 m) Check Reference 1 and arrange it in proper format n) The format of references could be improved.	We have made an effort to take into account all your remarks and have tried to wear the changes that were necessary.
Optional/General comments	The study needs more planning and effective use of data presentation tools.	

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)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20