

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130553
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Food Safety Practices, Associated Factors and Microbial Contamination of Fried Nile Perch in Mwanza City Markets: A Cross-Sectional Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is significant as it highlights critical gaps in food safety practices and microbial contamination in fried Nile perch in Mwanza City markets. It provides valuable insights into the socio-demographic factors influencing these practices and establishes a strong link between inadequate hygiene, poor waste management, and microbial contamination. The findings serve as a foundation for policymakers and public health authorities to design effective interventions to improve food safety standards, ensuring safer food for consumers and reducing the risk of foodborne diseases in low-income settings.	Thank you, dear reviewer, for realizing the importance of this study, and how it contributes to the improvement of food safety standards thus minimizing food-borne illnesses to low-income consumers.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title, "Assessment of Food Safety Practices, Associated Factors and Microbial Contamination of Fried Nile Perch in Mwanza City Markets: A Cross-Sectional Study," is descriptive and clear. However, to make it more engaging and concise, you might consider: "Food Safety Practices and Microbial Risks in Fried Nile Perch: Insights from Mwanza City Markets".	Thanks for a very insightful title suggestion, dear reviewer. It is very compelling to go with, but I'm a bit worried if the associated factor's part is left behind. Is it okay to proceed without that part in the title?
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is detailed and provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and recommendations. However, it could be refined for clarity and conciseness. Suggested improvements:  *Explicitly mention the public health implications of microbial contamination. **Avoid repetition (e.g., tap water usage is mentioned twice). ***Provide more focus on actionable insights derived from the study. Example adjustment: ****Instead of stating "temperature control during transportation showed a significant association (, )," clarify the specific findings (e.g., "Transportation at ambient temperatures significantly increased contamination risks").	Dear reviewer, thanks for your valuable insights. I have included the public health implications of microbial contamination in the first line of the abstract. I think tap-water usage is written once in the abstract. I have also included more actionable insights that are derived from the study.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is methodologically sound, using appropriate statistical tools like chi-square tests and aligned rank transformation analysis. It adheres to established microbiological standards for food safety and thoroughly investigates the links between socio-economic factors and hygiene practices. However, ensure that:  *Statistical results include complete p-values and significance levels. **Conclusions explicitly tie back to the public health importance of microbial contamination.	Thanks for these insights' dear reviewer.  I have ensured that statistical values include complete p-values and significance levels. I have added the implication of microbial contaminants on the health of the consumers in the conclusion part.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are generally sufficient and relevant, covering local and global studies. However, some references might benefit from more recent or region-specific studies on microbial contamination in ready-to-eat foods. Suggestions:  *Include updated research on microbial contamination in fish products from similar low-income settings or African regions (published post-2020). **Add references for the recommendations on pest control and safe handling of food, ensuring alignment with global food safety guidelines.	Dear reviewer, thanks for these useful insights. I have included some updated research on microbial contamination in fish products in low-income setting. I have also included updated references for the recommendations on pest control and safe handling of food, aligning with global food safety guidelines.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable but could benefit from minor edits to enhance clarity and readability. Common areas for improvement:  *Simplify overly technical sentences in the abstract and introduction for broader accessibility. **Correct occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasing (e.g., "as family income amid a harsh economy" could be simplified to "as a primary source of family income in challenging economic conditions").	Thanks for highlighting the areas of improvement dear reviewer. I have incorporated the changes.
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	