



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
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	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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Title lacks clarity. How appropriate is the phrase 'induced mycotoxin levels' in the title? - Grammar should be improved throughout the manuscript. Seems the manuscript was written in a rush. - There is lack of consistency in abbreviation of mycotoxins. The toxin should be written in full at first mention with the abbreviation in brackets. - Abstract line 16 is it aflatoxin B1 or B2? - Introduction line 46 what aspect of mycotoxin	necessary editing made in the text as suggested



SDI Review Form 1.6

	producing fungi? Last sentence in introduction is misplaced. - Missing from the introduction provide details of the diseases treated with the four plant species. - Also provide details of the mycotoxins produced by the different fungal pathogens isolated in the study and their effects on humans. - Section 2.0 where are the forests where sampling was done located? - Provide details of the common names of the four plants. What plant parts were collected for field samples and the stored samples? - Section 2.1 were any antibiotics added to PDA? If not how were bacterial contaminants avoided? - Line 70: what do the authors mean by '... developing fungal colonies were recorded, isolated.....? Isolation should be in reference to getting the fungus from the plant tissues and not sub-culturing. Also do the authors mean sub-cultured or purified in line 70/71? - Line 73 what specific keys were used to identify the isolated fungi? - Section 2.3 what were the limits of detection/quantification of the various mycotoxins? - Section 2.3 line 125 – few ml left? Grammar. - Line 32 at what probability level? Results section - Authors refer to number of fungi instead of fungal species. This should be corrected throughout the results section. - Results should be written in past tense. - Line 159 what is aft? Toxin name should be written in full and abbreviation in brackets. - Line 160 – B1B2 what are these? The reader has to guess it is aflatoxin B1 and aflatoxin B2 - Line 170: och. A is this ochlatoxin A? Poor	not the part of present study its well documented and sufficient literature available on this aspect } details mentioned in text no, exptt. conducted in aseptic condition. its not subculturing exactly, fungus were isolated from plant parts..details mentioned in section 2.1 British Mycological Society (BMS) keys and other standard literature were used for the purpose. mycotoxins present even in low conc. was detected, but quantification was not possible where it was present in traces only. done done already in past tense } edited as suggested
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	abbreviation. - In modern nomenclature there is no species known as <i>Fusarium moniforme</i>. This species has been re-classified as <i>Fusarium verticillioides</i> and <i>Fusarium proliferatum</i> - Table 1 details on % incidence should be captured in the table title. Column 2: is it list of mycoflora or fungal species? Footnote what kind of deviation? Standard deviation? - Table 2 is confusing. How is it possible to show the mycotoxin produced by some species without showing the levels/range detected? Why is the last column empty for some species? - Table 4 title is misplaced and incorrect. Data presented in the Table does not reflect any changes in total alkaloid.	I agree, nomenclature has changed, however, <i>Fusarium moniliforme</i> still in use edited as suggested standard deviation if the quantity is not measurable, level/range can not be mentioned. formatting error, corrected. significant changes in alkaloid content recorded
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author(s) should pay keen attention to grammar and abbreviations	