SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Food Science Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AFSJ_48213**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ANTIBIOTIC SENSITIVITY PROFILES OF SALMONELLA TYPHIMURIUM AND E. COLI O157: H7 ISOLATES FROM READY TO EAT CHICKEN MEAT.**
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	This study is very important especially in the public health. However the following needs to be addressed: 1. What was your sampling criteria? This appears un scientific. What standard guideline followed to collect these samples?? 2. Perceived level of hygiene standard and the quality of food and service offered by the eateries is relative. What was your guiding tool? 3. What is FDA/AOAC BAM??? The authors need to explain this method to the audience or reader? 4. What and how some modifications were made to isolate E coli and Salmonella? . 5. The obtained data was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency tables and charts. The author is advised to provide raw data for comparison with stated results. 6. There are standard isolation guidelines for *E. coli* and *Salmonella* and identifications. Why were they not used? 7. What was the manufacturer of Mueller-Hinton agar as well as other media and how were they quality controlled? 8. There many editions of Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, so which edition are u referring too? 9. The authors states that "Test method on Mueller Hinton Agar, some modifications were however made" what are those modifications? 10. Author states that "All confirmed isolates were subjected" How was confirmation date??	
Minor REVISION comments	NA	
Optional/General comments	This work appears to be imperfect in some ways. There is a need for the author extensively address the mentioned issue in the methodology. I have not looked at the results and discussion because I doubted the methodology used which means the results might not be clear.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Baguma Andrew***
Department, University & Country	***Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda***