

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Advances in Nephrology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJANR_88098
Title of the Manuscript:	ASPARTAME ADMINISTRATION CUM MORINGA OLEIFERA SEED EXTRACT: BLOOD GLUCOSE INDICES AND RENAL TOXICITY PERSPECTIVES
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.journaljamr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The topic of the article is current and interesting, however, the writing, the lack of information and the need for changes in some topics are extremely important.	
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction: Rewrite the introduction, not using topics, and covering concepts more relevant to the article's theme (as per the comment included in the document in the manuscript). Methodology: Include data from substance administration protocols (dose, time, etc) to which the nine groups of animals were submitted; describe information about univariate analysis; more details on ethical approval; set reference cut-off points for blood glucose. Results: In the Table and Figures describe statistical analysis data, significance level, information regarding the nine types of protocols (footnote); when describing the results, mention to which table/figure the information is being referenced; include brief description of results of all Tables/Figures, including data of statistical significance; describe renal histological images as "image" or just letters (A; B; C...) and not as "Figure" (see manuscript comments for details). Discussion: I suggest reviewing the way the discussion is written; start with a brief paragraph with all the results found and after starting the discussion of the most important results; include study limitations. Include conclusions.	
Optional/General 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:	Aline Porciúncula Frenzel
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Pelotas, Brazil