



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Still several typing and grammatical mistakes, these need to be corrected Please address the comments in the text Still the low number of samples I find problematic – either the number of samples is statistically sufficient; but the high cost of consumables can't be a reason for low number of samples Secondly I also find sampling of marketed products without any standardization in production processes is leading to high level of variability	We again carefully reviewed the manuscript and find typos and grammar mistakes and corrected them. The low number of samples is not a problem for the purpose of this study. We clearly indicated in the conclusion that this is a preliminary study. Had we assumed this is a representative sample of Jordan representing conclusive national levels of AFM1 then it would become a problem to have a low number. The finding is novel and new. For the first time carrot juice is shown to have a dramatic reduction influence on AFM1 during fermentation. We also had other products of normal fermentation, garlic and black cumin as comparison and they were more or less following the same direction of the influence of carrot juice but not as significant of a reduction. This is reassuring and increasing the validity of this study. Once this study gets published, it will encourage other investigators to prepare a large study focused on this finding and the potential applications in real world situations. This could make a major public health difference and enhance industry production procedures using natural detoxification in countries with high AFM1 in milk products. Each sample is its own control because we are comparing different time points to baseline of the same sample so variability is not an issue. The variability we found in the products from the market is important information indicating there are different processes leading to either contaminated or less contaminated product. We would have been worried about the study validity if all the products had very comparable AFM1 levels. The next step would be for other investigators to document these different production processes to identify where the contamination is being introduced in the production and develop a standard process with the least contamination. Such investigation is beyond the scope of this paper.