ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:	
Date Manuscript Received: February 6, 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: January 31, 2017	
Manuscript Title: Detection and genotoxicity of OTA in raisins		
ESJ Manuscript Number:		

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

Questions	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]	
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4	
(a brief explanation is recommendable) In the title there should be no abbreviations.		
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4	
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract is clearly. It would be very important to comment that the genotoxicity tests were performed with 12 and 15ng/ml because these were the concentrations of OTA detected in local raisins.		
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5	
(a brief explanation is recommendable) There are few grammatical errors		

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5	
(a brief explanation is recommendable)		
The methodology was explained clearly		
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3	
(a brief explanation is recommendable)		
The results commented are important, taking into account that in Argentina the study of OTA in the vineyards is not carried out. But in Table 1 the values of % and Mean+/-SD are not clear.		
The authors should explain how the mean values were calculated? And becalarge standard deviation (SD)	ause they have such a	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
(a brief explanation is recommendable)		
If the table with the results is duly clarified and the data continue to show h differences the conclusions support the content.	ighly significant	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4	
(a brief explanation is recommendable)	·	
The reference are appropriate		

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Major revision:

- The table 1 must be clarified, the column with % and Mean+/-SD have very dissimilar

values.

- Comment in results because the concentrations of 12 and 15ng/ml of OTA were

investigated in Allium cepa analyzing chromosome aberrations an micronucleous.

Minor revision

-In the title do nto include abbreviations

-In the work the names of the mentioned species must be written in the same way along the paper (ei: *Aspergillus carbonarius, Allium cepa, etc*)

-In the introduction Alternaria alternate should be introduced

- In tabla 1 correct concentration (ng/ml)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The work is simple and concrete. The main value is that the study of contamination with the mycotoxin (OTA) is not performed in the Argentine Republic, therefore its detection and analysis of genotoxicity is of great interest. The outhors should be emphasized that the analyzes in dried vine fruit showed concentrations of OTA between 10 and 15 ng/ml, for this reason the clastogenic assay was performed at 12 and 15ng/ml.

It is very important to clarify Table 1 to confirm the significant increase in chromosomal aberrations and micronuclei observed in *Alluim cepa*





