

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_99074
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Hyani date (<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i> L) peels on blood sugar, blood lipids, liver and kidney functions, and inflammation in diabetic rats.
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:

(<https://www.journalejns.com/index.php/EJNFS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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) Yes</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Yes</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? See comment</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. yes</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The author has mentioned in both the abstract and conclusion sections that it is recommended by eating the whole fruit of date without peeling. This recommendation is not related to the findings of this study.</p> <p>2. Typing error, <i>Coryphoideae phoeniceae</i> → <i>Coryphoideae Phoeniceae</i></p> <p>3. Which is correct, palm date fruit or date palm fruit? Please re-check and correct the error.</p> <p>4. The bioactivity of the peel powder and the peel methanolic extract was compared in this study. The rat was given the extract, which was made by macerating 300 g of dried peel powder in methanol, at a concentration of 250 mg/kg body weight. Meanwhile, the peel powder was made by crushing the dry peel, and it was combined with the basal food at a concentration of 5% w/w.</p> <p>4.1 What dosage of dry peel powder, measured in mg/kg body weight, was administered to the rat?</p> <p>4.2 Did the rat consume all of the food? Is it certain that each rat receives the same amount of the peel powder?</p> <p>4.3 Because the rats had different doses of dry peel powder and peel extract, it's possible that the conclusion that the peel extract was superior to the peel powder was erroneous.</p> <p>5. Only the peel powder was screened for phytochemicals and its chemical composition was assessed. The results were unable to be related to the extract. Therefore, it is incorrect to claim that the bioactivity of the extract was attributed to either its chemical composition or its phytochemicals. Only the components that were dissolved in methanol were considered to be responsible for the extract's bioactivity.</p> <p>6. In the material and method section; The heading "Phytochemicals Screening of the Date <u>Peel Powder</u>" but the body text "Phytochemical screening was performed in the <u>peel methanolic extract</u> to identify the presence of bioactive compounds" Please recheck whether the peel powder or peel extract was used for the experiment.</p> <p>7. How many samples were used to calculate the SD in Table 1.</p> <p>8. Always express in the body text what reader should take away from a Table. Use a reasonable amount of body text to interpret a Table. Avoid repetition when interpreting. There is no need to repeat all the results from the Table in body text if there are nothing insightful to say about them.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes</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:	Worapan Sitthithaworn
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand