

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_101875
Title of the Manuscript:	Health Implication of Mycotoxigenic Fungi and Mycotoxins Analysed from Sun Dried Yam and Potato Chips Sold in Minna Niger state
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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES. The manuscript analyzes the levels of mycotoxin contamination in products for human consumption widely consumed by the population of Minna, Niger State, Nigeria</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>PARTIALLY.</p> <p>YES</p> <p>I SUGGEST A SERIOUS MAJOR REVISION. The authors of the manuscript adopted descriptive statistical analysis, presenting means and standard deviation of the means of the evaluated data. Despite applying analysis of variance to the data obtained, they do not present a mean comparison test or a P value to compare, for example, levels of contamination between the foods evaluated by a certain mycotoxin and establish which of them presented the highest or lowest level of contamination or even which of them presents a greater or lesser risk to the health of consumers. Therefore, I suggest that the data obtained be submitted to analysis of variance and a mean comparison test (T test, for example) and establish the P value (5%, for example). Afterwords</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>As for manuscript formatting, check fit paragraph and check font size throughout the text. Also check the units used in the tables, especially the values expressed in micrograms per kilogram ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}$), microgram per body weight per day ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg bw}/\text{day}$) (table 10). Table 1: insert a footnote to LOD: limit of determination and to LOQ: limit of quantification Keywords missing. At RESULTS section: When presenting the results of the different analysed variables, refer in the text to the respective Table in which the results were presented, as done in item 3.6. CONCLUSION section: Among the products evaluated from five markets in Menna, which is the safest for the consumer? The last the last paragraph of this section presents results and not a conclusion.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cristiane Ferreira Prazeres Marchini
Department, University & Country	Brazil