

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_69613
Title of the Manuscript:	FERMOTEIN DOES NOT EXERT GENOTOXIC EFFECTS IN BACTERIAL REVERSE MUTATION AND IN VITRO MAMMALIAN CELL MICRONUCLEUS TESTS
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

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>Add line numbering in the manuscript to facilitate any revisions and / or corrections;</p> <p>2. Repetitions in the introduction (1st and 2nd paragraph) carefully double check the text;</p> <p>3. Introduction too short and not very thorough: expand introduction with more bibliographical references and more information about the study in question;</p> <p>4. How many slides were read for the NM test?</p> <p>5. How many cells (BN) in total were counted for each slide?</p> <p>6. How was the CBI calculated?</p> <p>7. Why did the authors not follow and cites the <i>Fenech</i> protocols other than OECD guidelines (Fenech, M. (2007). Cytokinesis-block micronucleus cytochrome assay. Nature protocols, 2 (5), 1084)?</p> <p>8. We speak of genotoxic damage referring to the formation of MN and cytostasis / cytotoxicity referring to the CBI, why were NBUD's not also observed as an index of genotoxic damage? NBUD's are generally considered in this type of test, as they are also biomarkers of genotoxicity. there are another nuclear anomalies such as nucleoplasmic bridge and NBUD's. Every marker evolved into the CBMN cytochrome assay.</p> <p>Amplified DNA is localized to specific sites at the periphery of the nucleus and is eliminated via NBUDs during S phase of cell cycle. NBUDs have the same morphology of MN but they are connected to the nucleus by narrow of nucleoplasmic material.</p> <p>9. Is it possible to provide an image of the cells observed under the microscope during CBMN assay? (BN cell with MN)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The manuscript is very well written, so I encountered some minor rather than methodical editorial errors. The manuscript is adequately divided, the abstract is concise, I found several repetitions in the introduction, moreover the latter is quite poor in information and bibliographical references. The need for this study must be well addressed in the Introduction section in detail. The important experimental conditions and the number of samples for each data must be clearly provided. The manuscript should be implemented in the introduction and checked more carefully. The author is also encouraged to add recent research findings to best justify this study. After all corrections, the manuscript can be accepted for publication.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giulia Vecchiotti
Department, University & Country	University of L'Aquila, Italy