

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_130428
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of the microbiological quality of beef marketed in commune I of Bamako district
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<div>1) In the introduction, the authors mention the risk posed by the presence of pathogenic microorganisms, which are responsible for meat spoilage. However, there are also spoilage microorganisms capable of creating a repugnant appearance in contaminated food, yet they do not produce toxins and/or pose risks documented in scientific literature, thereby compromising product quality. I also suggest updating the references used (Daube, 2007; Barro et al., 2005).</div> <div>2) At the end of the Introduction, the authors specify the microorganisms to be investigated (mesophilic aerobic flora (TMAF), total and fecal coliforms, Escherichia coli, Salmonella/Shigella, Staphylococcus aureus, as well as yeasts and molds). Why were these microorganisms chosen? Is there any national regulation regarding microbiological limits for the products in question? If no local regulation was followed, was it based on any international standard? Additionally, it is known that some of these microorganisms are significant to public health, as they can produce toxins that cause serious health issues. I suggest elaborating on this, particularly regarding S. aureus, E. coli, and Salmonella.</div> <div>3) In the Materials and Methods section, I recommend better describing what is meant by "MARKETS," as the characteristics of the locations where these products are stored may influence their microbiological quality.</div> <div>4) In the Materials and Methods section, under the analysis of Total Mesophilic Aerobic Flora, the culture medium used was not specified, unlike in the other analyses. To ensure standardization of the work and enable reproducibility of the study, this should be mentioned.</div> <div>5) In the Discussion section, could the high concentrations of microorganisms found be related to any specific characteristics observed at the collection sites?</div> <div>6) The presence of high concentrations of S. aureus and E. coli observed in the study is a significant concern, as it represents a serious public health risk due to various virulence factors produced by these microorganisms. I suggest further discussing this issue.</div> <div>I could not identify the source of the 8% of non-compliant samples for Salmonella spp. in the results tables, as there is no mention of Salmonella in the results. Please discuss why these 8% require closer monitoring.</div>	

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:	Julio Cesar Queiroz Penha
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil