



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AFSJ_48184
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial Quality and Safety of Traditional Fermented Camel Milk Product Suusac sampled from different regions in Northeastern, Kenya
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	<p>In this manuscript, the authors assessed the microbial quality and safety of fermented camel milk called Suusac. The paper is apparent, concise and well written. The introduction provides useful information for the readers. The methods are appropriate. The results are clear and compelling. The manuscript should be of interest to the readers of Asian Food Science Journal. The authors correctly cited literature with similar findings to theirs. Specific comments follow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Change the title for Table 1 on: Bacterial contamination and pH of Suusac milk samples from different regions in North Eastern Kenya. ✓ Present the percentage of samples contaminated by pathogens on the graph. ✓ Inappropriate reference citations ignoring the journal's format. ✓ Journal names abbreviated (NCBI databases). ✓ List the first six authors followed by et al. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Table title changed ✓ Samples contaminated are presented in a graph ✓ Citations done according to the journal format ✓ Journals abbreviated as advised ✓ Authors listed up to the sixth , then et al used
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	