

The authors did not answer to all referees criticisms (see referee LAR).

Moreover, what is the method used? What are the Criteria? How many paper consulted? How many discharged and why? Why so old literature? A decision three would help. English is poor and need to be improve.

Author Response:

Our manuscript is a narrative review on Fumonisin, and the databases including Science Direct, PubMed, and Google Scholar were used to collect the published articles from 1980 through 2018. The review was conducted using keywords: [*Fumonisin* OR *mycotoxin* OR *fumonisin B* OR *Fusarium*] AND [toxicity OR detoxification OR degradation OR mechanism OR metabolism OR occurrence OR prevalence OR intake OR limitation]. The list of references of included articles was also searched to identify additional articles. After first screening by the title and abstract, the eligible articles were downloaded. Inclusion criteria in our study were included: (1) Full-text available. (2) Review, mini-review, original, narrative articles, and books. (3) Published paper in English language (to avoid avoid mistake in the translation process). (4) Detect concentration of fumonisin B1, B2, and B3 in barley, wheat, oat, rice, corn and corn product such as corn grits, corn flakes, corn flour, corn meal, and corn kernel. The articles were excluded when they did not meet these criteria. Thirty-eghit years (1980 and 2018) was chosen as the investigated period.

We consulted more than 1500 paper, and discharged about 1300 paper of them. Finally 185 articles with 1706 samples were included in this narrative review.

We tried to choose easy and suitable phrases from old or new literature and, moreover, we added twenty-five new references from the last 5 years to our manuscript.

Feedback against rev comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments		

	<p>Fumonisin are dangerous mycotoxins for human and animals health. Their study is bringing more data in order to legislate their limits in food and feed. In my opinion the manuscript cannot be published in its present form.</p> <p>After introduction, next section should be Occurrence, then Metabolism and mechanisms, after it should be placed Toxicity, followed by Dietary intake and finally Detoxification.</p> <p>Bibliography should be updated, references must be from the last 5-10 years, no more, in order to be useful nowadays, as there are other reviews already published about the topic. As for example:</p> <p>Schertz, H., Dänicke, S., Frahm, J., Schatzmayr, D., Dohnal, I., Bichl, G., ... & Kluess, J. (2018). Biomarker Evaluation and Toxic Effects of an Acute Oral and Systemic Fumonisin Exposure of Pigs with a Special Focus on Dietary Fumonisin Esterase Supplementation. <i>Toxins</i>, 10(7), 296.</p>	<p><i>We changed the form of manuscript and resort highlights and manuscript to your order.</i></p> <p><i>We added more than twenty new references from the last 5 years.</i></p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>In all tables, add another column with the corresponding reference. In Table 1, change “some” for “in vivo” in the title.</p> <p>Line 50, correct have. Lines 50 and 58, change the beginning of the</p>	<p><i>We applied all of your comments</i></p> <p><i>Thank you, for your consideration</i></p>

	<p>sentence.</p> <p>Line 127, change create for a better term, as provoked or triggered.</p> <p>Line 172, use italics in <i>in vitro</i> and <i>in situ</i>.</p> <p>Line 219, correct urgent.</p> <p>References in the last section must be corrected.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		