



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	

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	Manuscript contains new and significant information for publication. The language should be corrected through the whole text. Title is appropriate and informative but abstract should be given good insight into the study. Material and methods are sufficient. The results are well summarized in Tables, and discussed with the literature knowledge.	Abstract has been revised according to the comments of the reviewer. Abstract has been formatted to the journal style.
Minor REVISION comments	Some corrections must be done. Author must polish the English style. Correct the grammar and spelling mistakes. P1 Line 24- 1.0 INTRODUCTION (0 should be deleted) P1-2- More literature knowledge should be added. P3 Line 64- 2.0 MATERIALS (0 should be deleted) P3- In material- sample collection title is enough for material, the other titles about material should be deleted. The author use the same title of thesis by Egbuta M.A. P3- 3.0 METHODS IMPLEMENTED (0 should be deleted) P5 Line 140 Immuno-affinity clean up and extraction procedure- Is this method used by other researchers? Please give bibliographic citations or a scientific reference for it. P5 Line 148- 3.4 Thin layer chromatography of mycotoxin extracts Also Is this method used by other researchers? Please give bibliographic citations or a scientific reference for it. P4 Line 102- "CH3OH" should be changed as "CH₃OH" and also	English has been edited by a native English speaker and grammatical and spelling mistakes corrected. P1 Line 24- correction made. 0 deleted. P1-2- More literature has been added to the introduction. P3 Line 64- Correction made to the Materials heading. P3- I have applied the corrections according to the reviewers comment. P5- Line 140 Bibliographic citations have been added to the method of immune-affinity clean up and extraction procedure. Line 148- 2.6 Bibliographic citations have been added to the method. P4 Line 102- CH₃OH has been changed to the correct format. P6 Line 172- In other to has been changed to In order to.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	changed other similar formulas. P6 Line 172- In otherto should be changed as “In other to” P6- In statistical analysis, You also must mention the number of replications for all the method used. Arrange the table titles according to the journal rules. Unit of the rang in Table 2 and 3 should be added in table not in footnotes. Arrange the table 6. Some dislocations were in table 6. The title “8.0 CONFLICT OF INTEREST” should be changed as “7. CONFLICT OF INTEREST” References should be arranged according to journal rules. Is this paper written by Egbuta M.A. and Dutton M.F.? If not, this manuscript is the part of the thesis. So besides these persons can not be publish this paper.	P6- The number of replications have been indicated in the statistical analysis section. Table titles have been arranged according to journal style. Unit of range in table 2 and 3 have been added in table and removed from footnote. Table 6 has been well arranged. CONFLICT OF INTEREST HAS BEEN CORRECTED. References has been arranged according to journal style With regards to the last comment on authors, I wish to indicate that Mary Egbuta did the laboratory work and write up for the study. Mike Dutton designed and supervised the study. Mulunda Mwanza did statistical analysis of laboratory results and edited the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is good and an important contribution in the field.	