



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_26297
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of maize storage technologies in Benin: Fungal ecology and mycotoxin contamination
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	The authors have tried to understand the relationship between storage practices/ technologies and toxigenic fungi population in stored maize in Benin. Ultimately the results will help to advice on the best technology that reduces fungi proliferation and minimise mycotoxin levels, hence safety of the stored maize. Unfortunately, the methods used especially the mycotoxin analysis has some limitation as could not help to quantify the mycotoxin. Further the method of extraction and the blue fluorescence of many of the mycotoxin on the TLC plate is too subjective although have slightly different retention time. Therefore it could be recommended the use of advanced extraction and quantitation method such as multi-mycotoxin analysis technique i.e. LC/MS. Further the statistical method is lacking some information as to be completed i.e. toxin levels. In addition more advanced statistical software could be used to enhance this work. <i>It is important to note that the presence of the toxigenic fungi does not correlate with toxin production and vice versa. Further the type of storage structure could also influence this phenomenon. Therefore knowing the toxin levels could strengthened this part of the</i>	1- It is a preliminary survey that we had achieved. Our goal was not to quantify the mycotoxin at this stage. It was to look first the presence of mycotoxin. In another study, we will use advanced methods such as LC/MS for the determination and quantification of mycotoxins in maize. Thus knowledge of the degree of contamination by mycotoxins will allow to valorize this part of the study. 2- Advanced methods such as LC/MS will show the degree of contamination by mycotoxins and this will strengthen this part of the study. 3- The manuscript has been reviewed and the errors have been corrected. 4- We solicited a person who writes and speaks English



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<i>study.</i> There are a lot of typos errors throughout the manuscript. Please check and revise. Further is are inconsistencies and editorial errors. May be the expertise of an English speaking person would be needed. Figure 1, figure 3. Legends are written in French. Please correct into English. There are many other in the manuscript. Figure 6, check spelling of “isolats” should read “isolates” Table 3. Check spelling of the fungal species. There are many other in the manuscript. Discussion • This section needs some improvement. I understand the authors could not differentiate between shelling and dehulling. As a results there are used inappropriately. Shelling and dehulling are two different postharvest operations. • Duration of storage is short-what is the storage duration? Please specify. • Name and active compounds of the chemical (s) use for preservation? References Make sure this follows the journal requirements.	fluently for the correction of the manuscript. 5- Legends of figure 1 and 3 were reviewed in English. See in the text. 6- The observation made at the level of figure 6 has been taken into account. 7- The scientific names of the species of fungi are reviewed and corrected both at the level of table 3 as in the manuscript. Discussion 8- The confusion between shelling and dehulling have been corrected. 9- The duration of storage of maize have been specified. 10- The Name and active compounds of the chemical use for preservation have been specified.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		References 11- References used in this manuscript observe the requirement indicated by the journal.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		