



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1- As the title of the article is beginning with AFM1 determination, in the abstract and in the paper, authors should follow the same order (e.g. they should give information, explain results of the AFM1 determination, and later write about detoxification).</p> <p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>2- Write 'antiaflatoxin M1 (AFM1 detoxification)' instead of 'antiaflatoxin M1 (detoxification)'.</p> <p>3- Correct the following sentence: A total of 22 samples of milk and dairy products were randomly collected from local markets and as follows:</p> <p>Add 'were grouped' before 'as follows' or put a full stop after 'market', and continue with 'Groups...'</p> <p>4- Omit (ppt) in the following sentence: Dairy products were analyzed for their aflatoxin M1 (AFM1) content (ppt).</p> <p>5- Correct the following sentence (e.g. adding AFM1 content or AFM1 levels at the end): Antiaflatoxin treatments of fermentation, high heat, garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>), black cumin (<i>Nigella sativum</i>) and carrot (<i>Ducaus carota sativus</i>) water extracts were studied to determine their influence on AFM1.</p>	<p>We have changed this to be consistent throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>We have changed detoxification to reduction as requested by the other reviewer and changed this description in the abstract as request by the reviewer.</p> <p>Done.</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>6- Correct the following sentence regarding highlighted words: The results show that AFM1 was detected in 81.8% of tested samples with varying levels ranging from 25 ppt to no detection.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1- Correct the following sentence as indicated: Aflatoxins are a group of mycotoxins, which came to our knowledge in the early 1960s of the 20th century.</p> <p>2- Add 't' to 'aflaoxin Q1'.</p> <p>3- Correct the following sentence considering this information 'AFs were classified as Group 1 carcinogens by IARC (IARC, 2002.)': AFB1 is categorized as class 1 carcinogen (definitely carcinogenic) for human, whereas AFM1 is a group 2B carcinogen (probably carcinogenic) for human [3]</p> <p>4- Line 37: Add another reference for the sentence which the authors have given reference 7. Because this sentence were found in another article written by Zinedine A 'Occurrence and legislation of mycotoxins in food'.</p> <p>5- Why authors repeat the same information for carcinogenic effects of AFs' in the line 26-27 and 43-44.</p> <p>6- Correct the sentences between the lines 60-70. Authors firstly indicated that they centrifuged infant Formula and dry yogurt (?). Later in the following sentences they explain how they did. It is not acceptable. The sentences should be rewritten.</p> <p>7- The authors used Elisa technique for the</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>We added the original source of that statement from the Codex Alimentarius which we already had and rearranged and renumbered the references accordingly.</p> <p>We have moved the sentence from 43-44 to be with the one at 26-27 and reworded them to qualify the information</p> <p>We corrected and reworded these two sentences</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>determination of AFM1. However, at the lines 73-77 and later they have given information about the other techniques. If they want to compare the different methods, they should give information about them in introduction or discussion parts. Therefore, these parts should be omitted from part of 2.2.</p> <p>8- Did the authors precoat the wells? If they used the kits, the wells should be ready. Therefore, they should reconsider explanation.</p> <p>9- Did they do recovery experiments for AFM1?</p> <p>10- Sentences between the lines 108-113 should be explained correctly.</p> <p>11- Correct the following sentence: Samples were prepared as in 2.1 for ELISA assay for possible antiAFM1 (detoxifying) effect of fermentation process on AFM1.</p> <p>12- Add a comma after (<i>Alium sativum</i>) at line 126.</p> <p>13- Authors control the effects of different plant extract in the presence of fermentation. Therefore, the title of '2.3.3. Plant extracts' should be changed' and the sentences should be corrected.</p> <p>14- What is the detection limit of the kit used? The</p>	<p>We only wanted to demonstrate that ELISA is a valid method by comparing it to well established older methods such as HPLC, and cited that. We do not want to discuss details of other methods.</p> <p>The wells were pre-coated and we only described the method described in the manual</p> <p>We agree with the reviewer if the aim was quantitative but we are more focused on comparativeness and therefore we assume the same recovery will be for the samples before and after the experimentation.</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>It is present in the lower range of</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>authors indicated only the quantitation range.</p> <p>15- Line 164: Legal limit of AFM1 for cheese samples in Turkey was given as 250 ng/kg in literature 8. However, the authors indicated it as 25 ng/kg. Please correct.</p> <p>16- Correct the sentence beginning with India (line 164).</p> <p>17- Figure 2: Add to X axis, 'Temperature and Time Values' as name.</p> <p>18- Figure 3: Add to X axis, 'Fermentation Time (h)'.</p> <p>19- Line 239: Correct this statement: European Standard maximum level of 50 ppt. It should not be indicated as written above.</p> <p>20- References should be controlled.</p> <p>21- Give the year of publication for reference 8.</p> <p>22- Give the volume and page number for the 10th reference.</p>	<p>quantitation of 5ppt.</p> <p>There was a missing zero and it is now corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>The authors would like to acknowledge and thank the reviewers for the objective and detailed review of the manuscript to further improve it.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	plagiarism issues No. The authors should add a new reference as indicated in correction advices for Introduction, point 4.	See response to comment 4
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Grammar should be checked. References should be corrected.	Checked. All references corrected