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)

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	**- Title is poorly shaped and needs adjustment.** **See suggestion in the corrected manuscript attached.** **- Abstract:** statements like **'**From the results obtained, it appears that the hygiene on the whole is unsatisfactory', should be better expressed in more scientific terms. Develop abstract to better show study design and other important information. **- Study period of January to February 2019 is too short.** **- Materials and Sampling:** NOTE: This is a crucial part of the study and requires clarity and compulsory adjustment. Then necessary aspects of the manuscript need to be adjusted as well for ease of flow and comprehension with respect to total samples collected and how collected. The last statement '**These samples were collected in the morning for breakfast foods, at noon for lunch and in the evening for dinner. 90 samples were taken and divided into twenty-one (45) hot and twenty-one (45) cold dishes, with two (2) dishes per restaurant, including one (1) hot and one (1) cold dish'**, needs to be reworked. **- Results:** Poorly presented and elaborated upon. **- Tables are too many for a short manuscript.** Tables 1 to 3 have the same title and can be merged into one table: same as tables 4 and 5, tables 6 and 7, tables 8 to 11, tables 12 to 14, and tables 15 to 18. Font size of 10 or 11 may be used inside tables. **- Manuscript needs to be read and certified by an English proof-reader.** **- Poor referencing detected in many instances. References required in many discussion sections. Authors should ensure the journal/publisher's reference guidelines are strictly adhered to.** **See attached corrected manuscript which include edits highlighted in yellow.**	We adopted your suggestion and then added the country for a specification. Your comments are relevant, but for the period of the investigation, we were wrong. We conducted the survey from November 2018 to February 2019. We have also improved the presentation of the data by merging certain tables with similar titles. We have taken into account all your remarks and have tried to wear the modifications in order to adapt the methods used.
Minor REVISION comments	- Most typos, sentences, words/phrases requiring corrections highlighted red, and with attached comments are shown in the reviewed manuscript attached. Kindly itemize here and comment on their status where adjusted. - Use reported speech throughout the manuscript. - 'Restorations' used instead of 'restaurants'. Quite poor, even though corrected on several occasions in the discussion section. - Reduce the use of quotes, i.e., etc., and informal/colloquial use of English.	
Optional/General comments	Looks like the article was submitted in a hurry with lots of errors in sampling method, typos and poor English and sentence construction. Authors should thoroughly read and have the manuscript read by an English proof-reader before manuscript submission to any journal.	

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