



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_39827
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Oxytetracycline Residues in Table Eggs in Khartoum State
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/journal/30/editorial-policy>)

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	While the manuscript delves into critical aspects of antibiotic residues in food, it lacks analytical fundamentals that are key to verifying the authenticity of the data. In most instances, data is repetitive. Since the number of samples from each of the three regions is given as 60 for a total of 180 samples, there is no need to present graphical data that reports the percent positive samples as well as the percent negatives as is in Figures 1 and 2. Report either percent positives with the negatives inferred from the reported data or vice versa. Another very crucial issue is the lack of validation data. I have included this in the annotated version of the pdf as follows: The validation data is incomplete. There are parameters that need to be evaluated in addition to the coefficient of determination R^2 which is an indication of linearity. The efficiency of the extraction method i.e. percent recovery and the precision reported as the relative standard deviation needs to be reported. The % recoveries indicate the accuracy of the method. The quality control is not fully reported. The calibration curve for OTC does not show what parameter was plotted as the y axis against an equally unreported parameter in the x-axis. Tetracycline was added to the samples at some stage and the authors do not indicate whether this was added as an internal or surrogate standard. All these omissions render the results invalid. There are other comments in the annotated version of the pdf which I will attach. I can therefore not recommend publication of this manuscript unless the authors go back to the bench and polish the data and completely overhaul it. I therefore recommend "Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered)" and the mark is given below.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kwenga Sichilongo
Department, University & Country	University of Botswana, Botswana