



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>)

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	This review seems to lack emphasis in the situation that prevails in the country of Cameroon, since in the summary, only given generalities so it is boring and does not interest the reader. This problem continues in the Introduction, to much general about the theme of mycotoxins. It is a problem of detail in each basic product or commodities affected in Cameroon, for each mycotoxin. Due to the lack of definition the conclusion is bad, and not clear, therefore it is suggested to write the most relevant about the mycotoxins contamination in 25 years of research in Cameroon.	Thank you for your remarks. As you have noticed the number of publications associated to mycotoxins in food is quite limited in Cameroon compared to many other countries, and this even in 25 years of research. This paper was written in order to give readers an overview of what has already been done in the country and what is still to be done in the field in order to protect populations health.
Minor REVISION comments	In the references consulted 22 were from Cameroon in a total of 85, I think that less than 25% is not necessarily a review in the country. Therefore, it is recommended strongly re-write the document.	
Optional/General comments	It is important to point out some general considerations but when dealing with a revision of a period, you should focus on it.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	