



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_41199
Title of the Manuscript:	REPRODUCTIVE & BIOMARKER RESPONSE OF MALE ALBINO RATS (<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>) TO A DAILY DOSE OF SOFT DRINK (COCA-COLA)
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 comment Material and method:	<p>Materials and methods: 1-line 83: 24 rats divided to 5 groups; it means 4-5 rats in each group and this is small number in one group for good statistics. 2- Line 86 & line 88:how is group 3& group 4 are the same volume (1.8 ml)?? 3-The author did not explain the duration of the experiment.? For how long time? And the treatment was daily or what? 4-The author did not inform the haematological method?</p> <p>Results: 1-The results with no significant differences are not differ from each other. 2-I am confused about the design of the experiment ; the auther said he has 5 groups and there are no 5 groups in the results (just control and test). 3- the results contain 4 weeks results: how can the author collect sperms from rats every week? 4- The design of the experiment should be rewrite. 5- the significants between groups are not understood. 6- revise references specially in line: 220, 223,224,232, 285, 288; they all should be as the same as all reference</p> <p>Discussion: 1- The author should explain the reason why coca cola lower the level of sperm count.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 51:change arrangement of ref according to year. Line 84: remve (0ml)</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The idea of the paper is good but the design of the experiment is not clear and the results are not so obvious ; I mean a lot of the results are non significant.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Nihal Mohamed Naguib Elguindy</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Alexandria University, Egypt</i>