

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_89713
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-diabetic and lipidemic effect of muskmelon fruits and seeds on streptozocin induced diabetic rat.
Type of the 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> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>a) On your 'Abstract', I would have preferred you to just say that, Musmelon is used as an alternative for traditional medicine than saying it has low glycemic index and that it is used in the management of diabetes mellitus, this gave a bias on about your work before reading it.</p> <p>b) On your 'Result of Abstract', you stted you worked on the extracts of the fruits, seeds and Glucophage drug, I expected to see statistical significant values in explanation to the differences of your observation and findings in relation to blood gluscese levels as well as total cholesterol., but I didn;t see that.</p> <p>c) Under section 2.5.2 of the 'Induction of Diabetes', what is the difference between your study design Group of 1 and 2? In my opinion, there insnt any as you stated, Your correction should be that, Group 1 (Negative Control): Consists of rats fed with only rat chow while, Group 2 (Positive Control) should be: Rats induced with 42mg/b.wt of streptozotocin and fed with rat chow.</p> <p>d) You did not state how your sample was collected and stored in the different anticoagulant bottles to the laboratory for the different analysis of you intent.</p> <p>e) I expected to see the various results of fruits, seeds and Glucophage tablet as you earlier stated you analyzed but I only saw that of fruits.</p> <p>f) In my opinion, you could have done that and analyze your results using the 'Tukey's Correlation' that way , we could have gotten more information about your analysis and the message of your intent.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The research could have given some vital contribution to knowledge if the above corrections were included from the onset, I feel the writer can do better if these corrections are implemented.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcella Tari Joshua
Department, University & Country	Bayelsa Medical University, Nigeria