



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_37310
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of HACCP safety system and good manufacturing practices in a multi-product soft drink bottling plant
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>)

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	The article evaluates the functioning of HACCP and GMP systems in soft drink company in Nigeria. It is an interesting elaboration, however, more effort should be made in drawing conclusions. Furthermore: 1. The authors should try to explain the attitudes of workforce using survey data (line 407) as well as make some suggestions for improvement based on the information gathered on the facility (line 448). 2. An analysis/investigation of results should be an aim of the research, not merely the quantitative evaluation. 3. Are chemical hazards really less important? (line 26) Are physical hazards mainly related to packaging? (line 27) Please consider whole food industry when making such general statements. 4. Please provide standard deviation for brix in warehouse samples (Table 1) as well as indicate if these values are standard deviations	Slight modification of conclusion performed. New words in red 1. The effect of attitude added and retraining of staff suggested for improvement 2. Quantitative removed from aim 3. Chemical hazards are not less important. Sentence has been re-written 4. SDfor brix provided and indicated in Table 1
Minor REVISION comments	1. Please rephrase sentence in lines 17-18. 2. Line 42: please divide the sentence into two sentences. First should end after the word "FMEA". 3. Line 138:warehouse	1. Rephrased 2. Line 42 broken into 2 sentences as agreed 3. corrected
Optional/General comments	I advise English proofreading	MS has now been passed through the software Grammerly and proof read Thank you for reviewing