



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>The authors have not fully followed the reviewers instructions. They should once again go through the text and check mistakes. There is still erratum (names of bacteria, some are not written in italic, and when mentioned genera of bacteria abbreviation spp should not be written in italic).</p> <p>One of the reviewers remark was that chapter Material and methods had to be supplemented by a number of samples. My question is - if the meat is sampled in batches of 1 kg, why part of the meat is cut into 10 samples of only 10 g each. What happened to the remaining meat?</p> <p>I need explanation about sample preparation - why 2 g in 90 ml of sterile distiller deionized water? Unfortunately, reference cannot be found. Generally, for the preparation of samples we need at least 10 g of the sample and nine times more solvent (buffered peptone water or the like). The identification of microorganisms according to Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology (Holt et al., 1994) is perhaps not a newer and modern approach.</p> <p>Chek Table 1: Mean microbial quality of beef meat collected at different time</p> <p>Word mean?</p> <p>The written names of bacteria in Table 1 should be checked.</p> <p>It seems that the conclusions and recommendations are expected. If the meat is sold on the open market it is expected that the number of bacteria exceeded during the selling. Also, the authors did not explain what are the conditions of selling (meat in refrigerated cabinets, open cabinets, temperature during selling etc.).</p> <p>I think that authors must once again review the manuscript and amend it in mentioned parts.</p>	<p>The corrections on the above have been effected.</p> <p>The remainder was used to conduct a separate experiment on "effect of cooking methods on the microbiological status of beef collected at different time in Ekpoma market". Which was reported in <i>Asian food science journal</i> 2019.</p> <p>The observation is noted and been corrected to 10g. Reference is stated - Fawole and Oso, 2001.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>This work has its scope, results presented are based on the scope of the work.</p> <p>This has been reported on another journal which is currently being reviewed. That is "A comparative assessment of the microbial load of beef and chicken meat" Knowing that chicken is sold in a refrigerated cabinet and beef on an open cabinet.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>