SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CJAST_36107**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Meat Hygiene and Associated Health Hazards Awareness among Butchers and Meat Retailers in Jammu District of Jammu and Kashmir**
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	Line 20-21: The statement is very vague and too generalised. No mention of particular disease was stated. Similarly, the use of "found that…" is misleading because the study did not mention the health status of the participants before and after the study. **Methodology:** The study did not describe how the sampling/selection was carried out for slaughterhouses, butchers, meat markets, retail meat shops etc. The study is claiming lack of scientific approach in rearing animals, but the current study is also not following scientific approach in its sampling methods. Lines 104-105: The title should be modified to encompass all the subsections under it because the subsections do not really match the title. Lines 109-111: The authors are contradicting themselves in the statements. All the tables and figures in the manuscript can be merged as a single table. The referencing is generally very poor. The authors did not really discuss the findings of their study. Rather, statements in the results section were repeated in the discussion The sentence structure and grammar of the manuscript is generally bad and poor. Proof reading services should be sought to improve the manuscript.	Line 20-21: I have use word diseases (which may be bacterial protozoan or helminthic it is not bacteria or protozoa or helmithis) and there thousand meat borne diseases which can't be mention and in results I have mentions several meat borne disease. Here The word found was replaced with observed as some observation like cleanness of cloths ,there personal hygiene was observed as they wore unhygienic cloth so contact may be a big source of contamination. Methodology part has rewrite in detail now Line 109-111. **What contradiction you noted As** per your suggestion that replace word agree disagree with yes and no ,as the education status of most of meat handlers was poor i.e. illiterate and if I used yes and no option then almost of respondents will answer no, so after pre testing the schedule was developed with some modification and researcher was advised to note some observation beside interview. So in these line poor cleanliness was observed and as per their option personal hygiene is important so where is contradiction
Minor REVISION comments	Line 38: Reference should be cited Lines 42-44: Reference Lines 51-53: Reference	For line 38,42-44 and 51-53 reference No [18] has being mention beside FAO and codex Alimentarius report which itself are reference
Optional/General comments	Line 8: Capitalize S in "state" Line 8: to access should be changed to either " to investigate or to determine or to evaluate or to assess" Line 36: Sentence structure. Line 41: patterns Line 57: cut to slaughter	add capital S done--- done done done

	Lines 60-62: sentence structure Lines 66-67: Not clear Lines 70-72: Sentence structure	done done done