

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_98440
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Knowledge on Aflatoxin Among Broiler Farmers in Nairobi City County, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1- Although the manuscript is original, in my opinion, as it is, it lacks scientific rigor, since few data are provided on what was asked and evaluated in the survey of farmers. It would be more complete if the authors explained the data they claim to have requested. 2- Yes, but I change by "Determining aflatoxin knowledge among broiler farmers in Nairobi City County, Kenya" 3- Yes. 4- Yes. 5- No. As I commented, the article tries to give information about farmers' knowledge regarding aflatoxins. However, I believe that few evaluated data are shown and results of other parameters that the authors evaluated in the surveys could be added. 6- Are enough but I suggest the book "Micotoxinas en Rumiantes. In: Micotoxinas y Micotoxicosis. Eds. Antonio J Ramos, 1er edición, AMV Ediciones." The chapter 9, page 221, is about toxins in farm birds.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	The article is well organized and explains well what was done. However, it seems to me that more information should be given regarding the parameters evaluated in the farmer surveys for the manuscript to be complete. I think the results are incomplete, making the discussion so too. I suggest that everything evaluated in the survey be added to the manuscript and that it not be expressed as "the majority of farmers...". This must be reflected in facts and numbers. On the other hand, the conclusion is based on already established results. Please rearm it. manuscript could revised and rewrite, adding the requested information	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daiana Garcia
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Río Cuarto, Argentina