



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_36022
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Gum Arabic as Prebiotics and lactobacillus casei shirota (LcS) as probiotic on Oxidative Stress and Renal function in Adenine-Induced Chronic Renal Failure in Rats
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. Statistical differences were shown by superscript. However many values do not possess superscript. It should be depicted with different superscript if it is significant. Leaving without superscript may lead to confusion for the readers. The reply is poor. Authors should mention superscript for all the values to show differences. For example, in table 2 for feed intake authors have mentioned different superscript if they are significant and same superscript if they are not significant. However, some values are left without superscript. Those values should also bear superscript based on the significance or non significance. Authors should consult a statistician or should look for more articles to depict the results in a better way. 2. Authors have again left the figures without any superscript. How readers will come to know about the significance between the groups. 3. Figure 2: serum urea. In Group 7 where is the SE? 4. Discussion: Authors did not made any attempt to explain the combined effect of GA and Lcs as per the suggestion from first review comments. 5. Methods: Urine specimens were centrifuged at 900 rpm for 15 min, filtered to remove sediment and then urine volumes were measured. Please remove the word filtered. 6. Again authors have shown FER, but they have not discussed its results and significance. 7. FER significantly decreased in the treatment group in comparison to adenine group. Why? Explain	1. Statistical differences were shown by superscript. superscript for all the values have been added. Different superscript indicating significant difference $p < 0.05$ 2. Superscript. Have been added to all figures. 3. SE in group 7 for serum urea hs been added. 4. I explained the combined effect of GA and Lcs. 5. I deleted the word filtered. 6. I explained FER because there is no significant difference, as follow . 7. The results in table (3) revealed no significant effect of feeding GA or LcS in groups 3 and 4 as compared to normal control group 1. In addition the mean feed efficiency ratio (FER) showed non-significant difference in groups 5, 6 and 7 fed GA, LcS and their combination respectively as compared to adenine – intoxicated group 2 which.which may be attributed to the non significant effect of GA or/and LcS on final body weight in the current study.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

please. 8. Again authors have poorly replied to the below comment. They did not discuss this properly. They have quoted the reference for increased intestinal and renal excretion of Ca²⁺, Mg²⁺ by GA. However, in this study they found that GA treatment significantly increased serum Ca²⁺. How do authors explain this? 9. Source of Lactobacillus is again missing. 10. Discussion is very poor. Authors have only corroborated their findings with other studies. They have not made any attempt to explain their findings that how the treatments are decreasing the oxidative stress. The reply is not appreciable. They would have discussed in still better way. 11. Approval of ethical clearance for use of animals in the experiment: approval number has not been mentioned. 12. Reply is missing for the comment "Mention the name and place of software used for statistical analysis" 13. English grammar in manuscript is again a concern.	8. Discussion for increased serum Ca²⁺ has been added Increased serum calcium concentration upon administration of GA which might be due to increased calcium absorption and retention. This explanation is in accordance with that of who illustrated that Arabic Gum improve calcium absorption and retention in small intestine. 9. Lactobacillus casei shirota was provided by Yakult co. U.A.E. 10. I explained the current research findings, that how the treatments are decreasing the oxidative stress.(highlighted in yellow), 11. I n addition did estimation of the total phenolic and total flavonoids contents of ga to explain its antioxidant effect an a better way. 11. approval number has been mentioned Bioethical clearance: This study was conducted in accordance with academic and ethical approval Experimental procedures conformed to the guidelines provided by the CPCSEA for studies and the ARV resolution on the use of animals in research and to institutional guidelines. The study performed according to the recommendations of, Ain Shams University Research Ethical Committee, (FMASU REC) No. FWA000017585. This study was an animal study and consent to participate and for publication was not applicable. 12. Statistics were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS)software version 17.0 was used for all statistical analyzes (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). 13. The manuscript has been reviewed by a native English speaker.
---	---