SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJNFS_40694**
Title of the Manuscript:	**REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY & BIOMARKER RESPONSE TO A DAILY DOSE OF INDOMIE SEASONING IN MALE ALBINO RATS (Rattus norvegicus)**
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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/30/editorial-policy)

SDI 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	The manuscript `REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY & BIOMARKER RESPONSE TO A DAILY DOSE OF INDOMIE SEASONING IN MALE ALBINO RATS (Rattus norvegicus)` is an interesting and in time contributions. Glurtamate-containing products is a big problem of modern nutrition and needs more focused studies. The results are potentially applicable for development the issue and practical use. However, I have number of notes which do not allow to publish this MS in the current version. 1. **The title is very confusing and s**hould be reformulated according to the aim, hypothesis. What do Authors mean by "…REPRODUCTIVE TOXICITY & BIOMARKER 3 RESPONSE "??? this does not sound in the study I would recommend to focus on clear effects – like liver function (transaminases, …) etc. 2. **Material and method section** is written too briefly Missing many points like: Age of animal; Diet before and after treatment; Did rats consume any food other than INDOMIE treatment? etc. 3. **Major concern is in design.** What exactly was the hypothesis? What was studied - INDOMIE SEASONING or glutamate ? If the product is an object of investigation Authors should distinguish potentially toxic chemicals to study separately. The profound discussion necessary to explain the content of the product of INDOMIE SEASONING resulting toxic effects. If Authors do **refer to glutamate** the Manuscript has quite poor novelty, since new current links and causality mechanics in the matter is far to be elucidated in this study. Glutamate toxicity is very well-studied on rat models for immunity, oxidative, stress and other effects e.g., see papers: • Bunyan J, Murrell EA, Shah PP. The induction of obesity in rodents by means of monosodium glutamate. Br J Nutr. 1976 Jan;35(1):25-39. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1106764 • Savcheniuk OA, Virchenko OV, Falalyeyeva TM, Beregova TV, Babenko LP, Lazarenko LM, et al. The efficacy of probiotics for monosodium glutamate-induced obesity: dietology concerns and opportunities for prevention. EPMA J. 2014;5:2. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1878-5085-5-2 • Effects of diet containing monosodium glutamate on organ weights, acute blood steroidal sex hormone levels, lipid profile and erythrocyte antioxidant enzymes activities of rats https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2221618916301135 etc. I would suggest to consider citing these (and others relevant) papers in glutamate biology and clinical implementation of this knowledge. 4. **Study conduction** Design I very simplistic to povide solid evidence towards food toxicity. Too many different parameters assessed to obtain clear results and formulate relevant conclusions Research is extremely biased, too many various factors were not considered in the study. Author did not response to principle aims posed in current research neither on INDOMIE treatment nor on glutamate toxicity. 5. **Discussion and data analysis** The concept is not completed, as well as translational potential. How should results be translated to humans? What kind of **biomarkers** (mentioned in the title) could be used in humans? etc. What clear recommendations could flow from current research ? Also for legislation?	
Minor REVISION comments	- abstract was not structured properly; - discussion & outlooks - lack of new ideas; - some illustration / scheme would be appreciated;	

SDI Review Form 1.6

	- language needs some correction.	
Optional/General comments	I would recommend to provide the missed information and make corrections where relevant. It is essential to prepare extensive paragraph of study limitation with clear explanation points missed and future plans for research.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Rostyslav Bubnov***
Department, University & Country	***The National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine***