



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_47496
Title of the Manuscript:	Aspergillus niger as the Source of Ochratoxin A of Contaminated Pyrus communis in Taif Market.
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:

(<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	<p><i>Aspergillus</i> are the most common fungi in the world. It is containing about 250 species, classified into 7 subgenera with several sections comprised of related species, capable of produce potent mycotoxins. Black aspergilli are common food contaminants, with some of them involved in animal or human mycoses.</p> <p>The research presented in the manuscript makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of the isolation of black aspergilli found in contaminated fruits of <i>Pyrus communis</i> and the amplification of toxigenic gene linked to the production of Ochratoxin A. The study is relevant to the pear buyers in Taif Market because feed poisoning with fungal identified here could carriage a health risk especially in infants or immunocompromised individual.</p> <p>Before the manuscript may be published, there are some comments and recommendations that the authors should address first.</p> <p>1- Authors should write about the acceptable exposition range for OTA in humans and compared it with those found in the study. 2- Authors should be able to reduce the discussion. For example; there are too many details in the methods or results in others study that make lost the connection with the own study. 3- Primers and PCR cycles should be cited. 4- Authors should talk about recommendations to minimize the level of toxicity found in the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>- Authors should avoid:</p> <p>1- double space between words. 2- beginning a sentence with a number that is not written out. 3- beginning a sentence with a genus abbreviates. 4- abbreviating words without spelling it first. For example OTA.</p> <p>- Abstract need end with a conclusion - The objectives located in abstract and introduction, authors need change the word "definition" by "identification"</p> <p>- There is one not finished paragraph in the Discussion: "the total ochratoxin and ochratoxigenic genes (PKS15C-MeT and PKS15KS) detected in 27 strains of ochratoxigenic black aspergilli isolates collected from <i>Pyrus communis</i> samples"</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Luis Alberto Ramirez Camejo</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Purdue University, The United States of America</i>