



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_39486
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel Combination contains probiotic bacterial and yeast strains to reduction of Aflatoxin M1 in Milk
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/journal/30/editorial-policy>)



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>Note: Corrections are in bold for easy tracking but should appear as regular format in manuscript</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capitalize K in kluyveromyces in abstract section and in the entire manuscript. Corrected 2. 24h is repeated in abstract section, 5th sentence. deleted 3. Concluded is misspelt. Also Change "consist" to "consisting" in conclusion section of abstract. Corrected. 4. Use words: "Contamination" and "Milk" instead of "contaminated in milk" in Keywords section. Corrected. 5. Paraphrase 2nd sentence of introduction section: Aflatoxins can not only be found as contaminants in the stable diet (cereal grains) but also are found...corrected. 6. Delete the numbers 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 appearing 2nd to 4th sentences of Introduction. These lines were deleted. 7. Line 32: Destroyed not Destroy. Done 8. Line 87: Delete 9 -1 9 -1 9. deleted 9. Line 117: Derivitization is misspelt . not found 10. Line 121: Hexane is misspelt. Corrected 11. Line 126-127: Delete [Scaglioni and Badial-Furlong (2016), instead put [29]. This will have to change the orders of references in manuscript body text and reference section. Corrected 12. The results on Table 6 presents effect of different concentration of viable probiotic strains in removal of AFM1. This is well described in section 2.3. However, Table 1 shows dose treatment for viable and non-viable probiotics on AFM1. The non-viability aspect is confusing. Omit it. Deleted 13. The same confusion stated in correction no.12 above still appears in Tables 4 and 5 where now viability is mentioned yet its non-viability treatment. In contrast, Tables 8 and 9 are well understood since its strictly non-viable treatments. the information was inserted in the text. 14. Table 5: Delete the 195 appearing between yeasts and strains. Deleted 15. Under section 2.7 & 2.8, some strange numbers 183, 185, 190, 201, 203 206 & 209 appear between the sentences. It could be formatting problem or MS Windows incompatibility. Check the entire document to ensure the track grid numbers on the left hand side of the manuscript don't get inserted between the sentences. Corrected 16. Paraphrase the 3rd sentence in section 2.9. Its ambiguous. Also state clearly which samples constitute the controls and treatments? Also, state the sample size used each for treatments and controls. All was clarified and the size of each sample was mentioned in the text. This allows the readers understand the results as presented in section 3.7. 17. Use whereby instead of whereas in Last sentence, section 3.9 . Done 18. Insert "of" between concentration and viable in 1st sentence, section 3.1. done 19. Paraphrase 5th sentence in section 3.1: Is it <i>Bifidobacterium bifidum</i> being reduced or it is AFM1 concentration ? yes it is AFM1 concentration and it was corrected. 20. Under 3.1, the sentence where Corassin et al, (2013) should be paraphrased to indicate "The results of the study are in agreement..." [?] corrected Also delete the names of all authors mention in Results & Discussion section: Instead use numbers as required in publication guidelines. This is a MAJOR PROBLEM WITH THIS MANUSCRIPT. Done 21. In section 3.1, author [35] comes after [23], where are authors [24] – [34]? Corrected because repeated authors 22. No need of mentioning % before numbers in 3.2.1 DONE. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>23. Insert “of” between concentration and non-viable in 1st sentence, section 3.3. DONE - Begin 3rd sentence with capital ‘O’ and put comma after hand in section 3.3. DONE - Insert ‘was’ between <i>cerevisiae</i> and higher in last sentence, 1st paragraph section 3.3. Done 24. The name <i>thermophilus</i> in section 3.4, third sentence is misspelt. Done 25. Split the long 4th sentence on Fig. 1 (P+Y), section 3.6. It’s too wordy, cell wall overrepeated .done 26. The legends for Tables 11 and 12, also figures 1 & 2 is not clearly stated. Also the narratives in section 3.7 done Are control yoghurt samples really without probiotic bacteria? Because as stated in section 3.9, yoghurt starter (<i>S. thermophiles</i> and <i>L. bulgaricus</i>) acquired from dairy supermarket was used? The term “conventional starter cultures” could used as controls. Refer to correction No. 16 above. Understood -Also in table 12, indicate what the raw values represent for the various scores eg. 34% for appearance is out of what original sample size? 27. The results in Table 12 could be better if presented in form of histogram</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Mention in abstract the period and year when the study was undertaken. Done 2. State the sample sizes in abstract and methodology both for treatments and controls. Done 3. Table 11 has mean of scores, therefore an ANOVA would make the difference statistically understood. Done 4. Insert “for” before the between method and removal in conclusion section done 5. Delete was ‘as well as’ in the middle of 2nd sentence of conclusion, instead put “as well” at the end of sentence. done 6. In presentation of results, begin each finding with a narrative of instead of “Table 5 shows results .. or “Figure 1 shows shows scanning Electron Microscope ... done An example from this study of how to narrate results more clearly: The changes on the cell structure in combination of strains in each group (mixed probiotics strains, mixed yeast strains and combination of bacterial & yeast strains) was found to have undergone some morphological changes as revealed by scanning Electron microscope (Figure 1). This presentation format of results avoids readers from confusing whether it’s a legend for Tables or Figures being presented or it’s the results beings narrated and discussed. They were discussed in the text</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Study is innovative in control of aflatoxin contamination in milk.</p>	