



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_47548
Title of the Manuscript:	GRAM NEGATIVE BACTERIA ASSOCIATED WITH SPOILAGE OF TOMATOES SOLD AT MARARABA AND MASAHA MARKET IN NEW KARU LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN NASARAWA STATE.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>ABSTRACT:</b> The abstract needs more construction. Abstracts highlight major points of your research and explain why your work is important; what your purpose was, how you went about your project, what you learned, and what you concluded. It is a well-developed paragraph, should be exact in wording, and must be understandable to a wide audience. Abstracts should be no more than 250 words, formatted in Microsoft Word, and single-spaced, using size 12 Times New Roman font.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION:</b> the introduction does not provide sufficient background information for readers not in the immediate field to understand the problem/hypotheses. The introduction is too short. I think the motivations for this study need to be made clearer. What is spoilage? What causes spoilage? I recommend strengthening and clarifying the introduction</p> <p><b>MATERIALS AND METHODS:</b> The resulting tomato paste were first sieved to remove lumps and then subjected to tenfold serial dilution. Explain this statement</p> <p><b>RESULTS:</b> I think additional experiments are necessary to validate the results presented here</p>	<p>I followed the manuscript guideline for presenting abstract.</p> <p>Corrections have been made</p> <p>To avoid excessive sediment during culture so the tomatoes lumps were sieved.</p> <p>Correction has been made. Thank you very much</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>How was the mortar and pestle sterilized?</p>	<p>I used the mortar pestle made with glass that can be autoclaved. Thank you very much</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Generally, this article needs more construction. Follow the guidelines given on the journal website</p>	<p>Guidelines followed. Thank you very much</p>

**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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>No</p>	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	<p>No</p>	