



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ EJNFS _50090
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of chronic sweeteners consumption in lymphocytes of Peyer's patches of two mice strain
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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>I have reviewed the manuscript entitled "Effect of chronic sweeteners consumption in lymphocytes of Peyer's patches of two mice strain". Manuscript needs major revision before acceptance. My comments are below;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authors should change the term "Svetia" as "Stevia" throughout the manuscript 2. There is some conflicts regarding Splenda and Sucralose. Which is used? Because somewhere in the manuscript authors used Splenda and somewhere Sucralose. It should be uniform. If authors used Splenda and Stevia as trade mark they should be indicate their purity and where they obtained? Local market or other. 3. How the authors selected used doses? 4. What is s23 and s24 (lines 222-223) 5. Conclusion is not enough. Authors should change and edit 	<p>Changes and modifications to the document were placed in yellow to facilitate the review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We cannot change the term Svetia for Stevia because the commercial name of the product used is "Svetia". To clarify this situation, an explanation was added both in the introduction and in the material and methods. 2. The term Splenda was homogenized in the introduction and in the methodology, except in the discussion, where we talk about studies that used both Splenda and pure Sucralose. The trademarks of Splenda and Svetia were used, for which a justification was placed in this regard. 3. The dose was selected in accordance with the recommendations of Official Mexican Standard NOM-218-SSA1-2011 for non-alcoholic flavoured drinks. 4. We don't found this error: "s23 and s24 (lines 222-223)" 5. We change the redaction of the conclusions.
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



SDI Review Form 1.6

He revisado el manuscrito titulado "Efecto del consumo de edulcorantes crónicos en linfocitos de los parches de Peyer de dos cepas de ratones". El manuscrito necesita una revisión importante antes de la aceptación. Mis comentarios están abajo;

1. Los autores deben cambiar el término "Svetia" como "Stevia" en todo el manuscrito.
2. Hay algunos conflictos con respecto a Splenda y Sucralosa. ¿Cuál se utiliza? Porque en algún lugar del manuscrito los autores usaban Splenda y en algún lugar la Sucralosa. Debería ser uniforme. Si los autores usaron Splenda y Stevia como marca, ¿deberían indicar su pureza y dónde se obtuvieron? Mercado local u otro.
3. ¿Cómo seleccionaron los autores las dosis utilizadas?
4. ¿Qué es s23 y s24 (líneas 222-223)?
5. La conclusión no es suficiente. Los autores deben cambiar y editar