



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
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>The manuscript is not scientifically reliable and poorly discusses the survey and detoxification data. Only 25% of the manuscript references were recently updated.</p> <p>The selection of added extracts is not based on any scientific background and the data revealed from figure 3 shows a variation of concentration falls within the uncertainty measurement for ELISA method of determination of AFM1. There is no impact to detoxify AFM1 in levels below the European maximum permitted limits.</p>	<p>The comments are very general and by simply saying the study is unreliable without explanation is not helpful. The other reviewers did support the important of this study and its findings. It is not clear what is the problem of 25% of the references being recent? We were mostly guided by relevant literature. If the reviewer had other references to include we would be happy to include.</p> <p>The selection of the added extracts is based on other published literature that we cited regarding the three plant extracts and their detoxification effects. Regarding the variation of concentrations, we already addressed this that these are preliminary but important findings reported for the first time and clarified this in the new revised manuscript. The European maximum permitted limit is the lowest worldwide level (compared to the USA level for example which is 10 times higher). Therefore, our findings might be more relevant to the countries with high AFM1 above the European maximum level. We have this comment in the discussion section.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		