



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_9156
Title of the Manuscript:	Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points for the Production of Kunun zaki from Millet.
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	The grammar of the manuscript has to be improved. The authors failed to clearly explain whether samples were collected from commercial manufactures or local communities. The authors claim that hot water added at stage F in the laboratory preparation eliminated only coliforms and staphylococci. I find this strange because high temperatures are known to eliminate all microorganisms not just spoilage or pathogenic microorganisms. The authors should also report pH levels for other stages especially before and after fermentation this could assist to explain why staphylococci and coliforms were able to survive at low pH. Looking at the results in the different tables, there is currently no clear evidence that the fungi present was introduced by unclean packaging material. The fungal levels in samples from Bori-camp remained relatively the same throughout; I'm not convinced that unclean packaging materials are the source of fungi.	Nine samples each were collected from commercial manufacturers (Bori-camp, Rumuodomaya, and Mgbuogba) respectively. Same nine samples collected above were also collected for Laboratory studies. Please check the main article for clarification. pH levels are shown below. Fungi, mainly molds were not only introduced by unclean packaging materials, but also the spices that were not thoroughly washed by the commercial manufacturers. I agree with you that the fungal levels in Bori-camp are relatively the same, the counts came out to be that way after several plating.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article is not clear on where exactly were the samples collected, the authors need to clarify this. In the abstract they imply the samples were from commercial outlets while in the introduction they mention that they will compare qualities of laboratory produced and hawked kunun drinks. The lack of clarity could have a negative impact on the recommendations made. If samples were collected from local villages the current recommendations such as the use of mechanized systems of harvesting might not be economically viable for poor communities but viable for commercial outlets. The authors need to provide alternatives for local communities as they also produce the product. If spices are known antimicrobial agents, won't the recommended washing reduce/affect their antimicrobial activity?	Samples prepared commercially were collected from Bori-camp, Rumuodomaya, and Mgbuogba. Samples prepared from the Laboratory were also collected and compared with the above-mentioned preparations microbiologically, nutritionally, and physico-chemically. Samples were collected from commercial outlets in Port Harcourt metropolis, not from local communities. Hence, mechanised system of grain harvesting is recommended. Thorough and careful washing after harvesting is recommended before being used. This when done will not reduce/eliminate its antimicrobial activity.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PRODUCTION STAGES	LOCATIONS	pH LEVELS
A	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	6.10 6.60 6.45 6.50
B	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	5.50 5.42 5.62 5.33
C	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	5.60 5.60 - 4.22
D	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	5.41 5.39 - 4.20
E	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	5.48 5.44 4.70 4.80
F	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	5.57 5.49 4.95 4.80
G	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA LABORATORY	4.90 4.90 4.92 4.60
H	BORI-CAMP RUMUODOMAYA MGBUOGBA	4.93 4.92 4.93



SDI Review Form 1.6

	LABORATORY	4.61
I	BORI-CAMP	5.16
	RUMUODOMAYA	5.12
	MGBUOGBA	5.00
	LABORATORY	5.15