



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_32890
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbial and Aflatoxins Analysis of Selected Cereal Flours Processed and Sold in Abakaliki Metropolis
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The summary does not specify the number of samples evaluated nor their replicates nor the date they were collected, it is advised to specify the type of ELISA used for aflatoxin analysis and the sensitivity of the method, the conclusion should be improved, The recommendation should be removed The line 38 of the introduction must be put aflatoxins are highly stable molecules that do not decompose easily by high temperatures as could be assumed by industrial processes. At line 40 must be changed to four metabolites, and line 44 remove it. Finally re-write the introduction .	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The discussion considers the proximal chemical analysis as a variable that does not contribute arguments that can be useful to his work since the variations that he encountered and that are discussed are expected because they are different cereal flours. The bibliography does not have the same size of letter, it contains bibliography unnecessary for the work as they are aflatoxin levels in other samples of foods and that do not contribute clarity to its work	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is not well written , it lacks essential details in the study methodology, the introduction is very long and gives the impression of a mini-revision. It does not focus on antecedents that support its study. The results it presents are not Conclusive, so it should not indicate that they are a consumer alert, since the methodological structure of the research is very weak .	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Silvia D. Pena Betancourt
Department, University & Country	Department of agricultural and animal production, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico