

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_109989
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of aflatoxin B1 contamination in animal feeds and aflatoxin M1 occurrence in fresh milk: A case of Kondoa District in Dodoma, Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community in Tanzania, because it provides new information on the prevalence of aflatoxins in animal feeds and fresh milk in Tanzania. This information can be used to develop strategies to reduce the exposure of humans and animals to aflatoxins, which are known to be carcinogenic. The study also highlights the need for further research on the effects of aflatoxins on human health.</p> <p>2. The title is fine, but an alternative, shorter title would be Aflatoxin Contamination in Animal Feeds and Fresh Milk in Kondoa District, Tanzania</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and conclusions. The abstract also highlights the importance of the study's findings for public health.</p> <p>4. The subsections and the structure is appropriate.</p> <p>5. Statistical analysis is weak. Descriptive statistics and chi square is not sufficient. In addition, results have many tables yet the text explaining the tables is not sufficiently detailed. Discussion is not sufficiently explored.</p> <p>6. The references are recent and sufficient, but as the discussion expands, more references may be required.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Akin Pala
Department, University & Country	COMU, Turkey