



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_45667
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycotoxin contamination of food and associated health risk in Cameroon: A 25-years review (1993-2018)
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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 contamination of foods with mycotoxins and subsequent exposure for consumers may have serious consequences on health. Climatic conditions that occur in Cameroon may strongly favour fungi development and toxin contamination, making this topic a major public health issue. Therefore, this review is of great interest. However, to my opinion, it has to be improved before publication and major revisions shall be done. Here they are following their order of appearance in the text. Regulation: to my opinion, a 3 page-long table on international regulation about mycotoxins has no interest here since do not correspond to the subject. I would have preferred seeing a description of regulation in Cameroon (if any) or a discussion about the differences that may be observed between countries and toxins. A table on the regulation existing in African countries could have been interesting. A reference for EU or US regulations is sufficient, no need to develop here. Table 3 has to be modified and classified to make its reading easier. Authors have to choose if they want to present results mycotoxin by mycotoxins or food by food but, as it, it is not possible to read it easily. As it, it is classified by reference which does seem to be the good choice for such a big table. To my opinion, a presentation toxin by toxin in this table and in the text that follows would probably be easier since authors could then present, for each toxin, the different contaminated foods with the corresponding levels of contamination, compare that with data in other countries and/or regulation (if any in Cameroon) and then end by exposure assessment. As it, the text is only a detailed presentation of the table but lacks a perspective on presented results. For instance, contamination levels with AFB1 appear to be very different from one study to another. This shall be discussed according to sampling, analytical method, climate, period, agricultural practices... and compared to what is observed elsewhere. For a clear presentation of exposure assessment, a presentation of "mean diet" would have been useful. The importance of some diseases that could be associated with mycotoxin exposure (such as liver carcinoma/AFB1 for instance) would also have been of great interest together with the exposure assessment. As perspectives, the problem of multiple exposure/contamination of foods and subsequent synergistic/additive effects could also have been evoked. So, to conclude, I think that a presentation of data toxin by toxin with, for each toxin a presentation of contaminated foods, levels, frequency and subsequent exposure assessment would make the paper clearer and more interesting for readers.	Thank you dear reviewer for your remarks and suggestions which were all taken into consideration. We have limited the presentation of regulations in the table to those of EU and US since they are considered as a reference worldwide. However, we have also mentioned some references on the regulations that exist in some African country. There is not yet a national regulation in Cameroon Table 3 was modified and presented food by food to follow the presentation approach we have had in the text.
Minor REVISION comments	Here are some minor remarks: Page 1, line 23: if compounds are mycotoxins, it is because they have a negative impact on health (not "potential") Page 2, line 30: more recent surveys also demonstrated even more important frequency of contamination of crops Page 6, line 87-88: indeed, the risk of contaminated foods to be consumed locally after market rejection or use for feeding animals is important leading to the possibility to exposure to high levels of contamination and/or appearance of residues in food from animal origin (milk) Table 3: what is the interest of ref 63 since 1800 analysis were done for AFB1 and no results are given (NS in the table...) How is it possible? Page 9, lines 123 and 127: strong differences were observed regarding AFB1 content in different products. This shall be discussed and compared. Page 9, line 128: what is the interest of comparing contamination level of kutukutu with EU	Ok Ok Erased It is the reference that the research paper authors had used to appreciate the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	regulation? Is it an exported product towards EU? Page 10, paragraph “peanuts”: authors present results indicating the presence of both FB1 and DON in peanuts... since these toxins are not so common contaminants of these commodities, it shall probably be discussed more in depth. Page 10, line 170: the levels for AFB1 and OTA appear extremely high... 250 mg/kg and 45 mg/kg respectively. Is it a typing mistake?	safety of this product. No, That's the concentrations that were reported by the research paper authors
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	