



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_15306
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of five major mycotoxins co-contaminating two cereal grains from Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original research 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper provides valuable, new data on the mycotoxin situation in rice and maize grown in Nigeria. The paper is well written and the data are analysed by relevant statistical methods. With minor revision the manuscript deserves to be published. The author should consider transferring some of the 5.0 Discussion into the 4.0 Result chapter which contains 7. Tables and only half a page of text.	I tried to transfer some of the 5.0 Discussion into the 4.0 Results but it was not meaningful to me. So, I decided to merge both results and discussion in one 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 12. "was" should be changed to "were" Line 27. Change "infestation" to "infection" Line 34 "in other to meets" change to "in order to meet" Line 40, 57 Change "implore" to employ Line 288 Change "alsoanother" to "another" Line 309 Change "favours" to "favour" Line 330 Change "from d stores" to "from the stores" Lines 334-335 It is not likely that fungi infecting the food on the market place explain the high level of mycotoxins in commodities on the market	Line 12. Was changed to were Line 27. Infestation changed to infection Line 34. Changed to in order to meet Line 288. Also anther changed to another Line 309. Favours changed to favour Line 330. From d stores changed to from the stores Line 40 and 57- the use of implore and imploring describes using or applying. SLine334-335- The statement has been revised. It is possible that fungi infecting the food samples at the market place can contribute to high level of mycotoxins if these fungi are mycotoxigenic. The food samples were always openly displayed exposing them different fungal spores in the environment. All other corrections have been applied.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The sampling and the analytical methods employed are “state of the art” methods and well presented in the paper. The tables are clear and the results are subject to relevant discussion. The paper deserves to be published and the authors have a long way to go before the mycotoxin situation in Nigeria is fully documented.	
---	--	--