



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
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	INTRODUCTION Line 48- Insert "ranging from" before the quantities 0.55 to 3.30ppm. Line 53- Confusing sentence. Is the traditional and commercial processing of kunun zaki the same? Contradicts the previous sentence. The flow diagram in Figure 1 is missing. Line 91- Elaborate on the involvement by several people. Do you mean excessive handling by different people increasing the chances of cross-contamination? Also qualify the statement. As given the statement is definitive, while the use of unsterilized containers and milling machine increases the chances of contamination. Line 93-99- The passage is not clear as it does not categorize organisms that have been isolated in previous studies of Kunun zaki from those that have been used as starter cultures and the ones used in commercial preparations. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Line 186- Rephrase the sentence to clearly indicate that from all the bacterial isolates that were characterized, how many genera and species were identified. Line 211- the name of the authors should be provided. Subheading 3.3 Total Heterotrophic counts	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	up to 3.7 Total fungal counts should all fall under one subheading of 3.2 Microbial counts.- The short paragraphs of each of the subheading, should be collapsed to form one paragraph. Instead of giving short statements of the results that are already provided in the tables, the sentences should highlight the trends of the microbial counts across all kunun zaki prepared in the different locations. This should be followed by a couple of sentences discussing the results in question with relevant citations in support of your analysis. 4. In writing the results, it is important to make a distinction between the stages and samples obtained during a particular stage. The stage of processing is not a sample. 5. The results in table 2 , Table 3, table 4 and table 5 should be presented in one table, to make an easy comparison of data . 6. Line 341- the name of the authors should be provided. 7. Line 344- the name of the authors should be provided. 8. Line 371- the name of the authors should be provided. 9. Subheading 3.10 water sampling prior to steeping to 3.18 Refrigerated storage (5°C) for three days, could be presented under one subheading entitled HACCP analysis of kunun zaki.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	10. Relevant citation should be used to support the potential sources of contamination /hazards. Line 434, 442.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	INTRODUCTION –line 44 1. Replace “one of the commonest “ with “one of the most common”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Total viable counts could be used instead of Total Heterotrophic counts.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer