



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_13622
Title of the Manuscript:	Aflatoxin M1 in Milk and Milk Products in Jordan and Methods for its Detoxification
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	<p>It is not proven that detoxification is the method that actually leads to a reduction in aflatoxin levels. What are the detoxification mechanisms; rather say reduction</p> <p>Have you tested if the plant products have an effect on the taste of the end-product.</p> <p>Need to review thoroughly the orthography of the whole article – many problems</p> <p>Very low number of samples – with effectively only 4 samples per product with no process control during the different detoxification methods since samples were bought in market</p>	<p>The term detoxification is changed to reduction including the title and the text where ever possible, as the reviewer suggested.</p> <p>Yes, we tested the end-product and had an acceptable and favourable taste.</p> <p>This has been done.</p> <p>For control for detoxification we treated each sample as its own control to measure what percentage of decline in aflatoxin levels. We agree with the reviewer that more samples would have been beneficial. However, it might have not been apparent to the reviewer that in Jordan as a developing country, there are very limited funds to support research. Each ELISA test was relatively expensive in the context of income in Jordan and we had to pay for them from our own personal funds. Therefore the number of samples were low but sufficient for preliminary data reporting for the first time about this important finding and as supported by other reviewers We have added to the discussion these two points of being preliminary findings.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		