



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	- Results section: Keep the verbs in past when referring to the results recorded in the study (lines 106 to 324); throughout the text in this part, verbs are presented either in the past or in the present. This presentation may confuse the reader. Keep results in the past and references to the literature in the present. - Lines 142-150: replace "environmental impact" by "the impact of the food-handling environment". Otherwise, the reader will think about impact on the environment outside the meat-handling site. Also, in this part of the text, replace "environment" by "food-handling environment" - Line 165: "presence of pathogen" should be "presence of pathogens" - Line 176: "Negative opinion regarding meat inspection should be changed by proper education" should be restated. I believe that negative opinion regarding meat inspection MAY be changed by CONSISTENT EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS. - Sentences such as Line 201 " It is established that dirty hands can lead undue cross contamination that may cause meat borne diseases" or Line 226 "The display, storage and sale of carcass/meat should be perfect from hygienic point of view" are presented without references in the results section. There may be a need for a reference to support this evidence, or these sentences should be placed in the discussion section. - Line 276 and line 391: "cent percent of meat handlers"??? - Line 344 "Negative opinion regarding meat inspection may be due to low education of meat handlers". This sentence should be restated. It is not the education that is low, but the lack of specific technical information. There should be at least some lines on the discussion on how these butchers are trained to handle meat in this country, and the possible role of the veterinarian or food inspection professionals in educating these workers. - Line 412 and line 35: "meat should be good enough" is too unspecific. This sentence should be restated using terms such as "high quality", "innocuous", or "fit for consumption". - There should be a major review in language usage and construction of sentences.	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Paula Tavolaro</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Veterinary School, Faculdades Metropolitanas Unidas, Brazil</i>