



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Microbiology Research Journal International</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_33596
Title of the Manuscript:	Mycotoxin Producing Fungi Associated With Some Medicinal Plant Produce And Induced Mycotoxin Level & Biochemical Changes
Type of the 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	Dear authors, The manuscript seems to be original and is well presented and organized. The described experiments were properly planned and executed. The results are presented in a clear way, and compared with the findings of other researchers. Check the queries below: 1. Materials and Methods. What was the number of fresh and stored samples? All the reagents used in the study should be mentioned in this section with their details (concentration, purity, etc). 2. Table 1. <i>Azadirachta indica</i> showed incidence of a large number of fungi while in <i>Plantano ovata</i> only <i>A. niger</i> was observed. Is there any explanation for that behavior? Please mention in the manuscript. 3. As methods of storage and prevailing environmental conditions affect the production of fungi, a table with mycoflora associated with stored samples should be introduced in the	fresh samples (60 No.) and stored samples (166 No.) Details mentioned in the text. <i>Azadirachta indica</i> and <i>Plantago ovata</i> are two different plants of entirely different nature, only similarity is that both possess medicinal properties. It is a well established fact that association of fungi as well as their incidence are governed by the nature of substrate, method of storage as well as prevailing environmental conditions. Mycoflora associated with fresh and stored samples already mentioned in the text, separate table may not be useful as objective is to study mycotoxin producing fungi, that has



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manuscript, in order to enhance the comparison between fresh and stored samples. - Does the results in Table 2 refer to both fresh and stored samples? Please confirm and mention in the manuscript. - The results in Table 3 refer only to the stored samples? - Page 1, line 18 and page 4, line 179. Twenty eight (28%). Please correct. - Analysis procedures for the natural occurrence of mycotoxin contamination should be explained in the manuscript. - AFB1 was not detected in <i>Azadirachta indica</i> in Table 3, while in Table 2 in <i>Azadirachta indica</i> ~20% toxigenic isolates with 0.4-13.8µg/ml toxin production were estimated. Please explain this difference. - From the mycotoxins studied only Aflatoxins were quantitatively estimated. It would be interesting in the future if the authors could quantify all mycotoxins contaminating these medicinal plants with HPLC methods or even with a multimycotoxin analysis using LC-MS/MS.	been explained through table as well as text. Both fresh and stored Stored samples only done detail procedure inserted Aflatoxins can be produced only under particular environmental conditions. The actual growth of aflatoxigenic fungi on any substrate does not necessarily mean that aflatoxins are also present. Moisture, temperature and insect or other injury as well as the <i>A. flavus</i> isolate, the substrate and the environmental conditions are particularly important factors in determining whether aflatoxins are actually produced as the fungus grows within the seeds or grains (Moore-Landecker, 1996; Wilson and Payne, 1994). Suggestion well taken and will be applied in the next study.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		