



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>Annual Review &amp; Research in Biology</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_ARRB_4925
Title of the Manuscript:	Capability of some pesticides to induce reproductive toxicity and teratogenicity
Type of the Article	Research paper

**General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:**

**[\(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline\)](http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)**

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



## SDI Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2:** 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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The justification in the introduction was poorly done and has to be rewritten. The objective outlined is different from what you carried out. In your objective also you said it was a review you were doing while you carried out an experimental study.</b></p> <p><b>In the materials and methods, you were trying to make short sentences on each of the chemicals you used. This should have been done in your introduction, while in at this stage you start whether they were analytical or commercial grade. You said albino mice was used , but later in your animal treatment schedule you said rats. Which one did you actually use for this work?</b></p> <p><b>You didn't state if you used any statistical method to analyse your result. It appeared you just gave us your raw result in those tables. You must subject this result to statistics before stating that any of them was statistically significant or not.</b></p> <p><b>The results and discussion was disjointed. You made several blanket statements that you work didn't address e.g lambda-cyhalothrin in male rats with different doses had no effect on fertility, but sexual competence was seriously impaired in male rats. Did you evaluate for fertility or sexual competence? You didn't discuss you result throughout instead you were discussing in details what some other authors did. You need to state clearly what you got and not discussing other authors' findings as if they were your findings.</b></p> <p><b>The whole of your results and discussion has to be rewritten because you didn't dwell on your findings but instead took so much</b></p>	<p>The objective of this investigation is to evaluate the computability of these insecticides to the environment and to determine the draw bakes of such chemicals on humans.</p> <p>In your objective also you said it was a review you were doing while you carried out an experimental study.</p> <p>In the materials and methods, you were trying to make short sentences on each of the chemicals you used. This should have been done in your introduction, while in at this stage you start whether they were analytical or commercial grade. You said albino mice was used , but later in your animal treatment schedule you said rats. Which one did you actually use for this work? <b><u>Was done.</u></b></p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b>time and space explaining other peoples work which were not really relevant to this study.</b></p> <p><b>Your conclusion and recommendation were clearly beyond the scope of your work. You need to limit you conclusion to this study.</b></p> <p><b>The tables were not explanatory. It appeared you just gave us raw values that were not subjected to statistics. I expect you to express them as mean <math>\pm</math> S.E.M. You used about 80 mice or rats, but didn't see you put this number into use on you table (n = ?).</b></p> <p><b>The photomicrographs are not self-explanatory. For each you need to state the exact abnormality you are trying to depict or the exact aberration.</b></p>	
--	--	--



## SDI Review Form 1.6

<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>There were several grammatical flaws in the write out. In the abstract, some statements you made need not to be there. Example, the later part of your objective were you said “with a view of possible extrapolation of the findings to man, as the processes and regulation of male reproduction are highly conserved in mammals”. “data suggest a potential association between exposures to tested used pesticides and decreased sperm quality”. Did you test foe association? If yes what statistical test did you employ for that?</p> <p>The concluding part of the abstract is not related to this work. It makes no academic sense to your work.</p> <p>The methodologies for some of what you did were not clear. Example 2.4. sampling, you need to recast the sentences.</p> <p>In consistency in your referencing in the write up. Several spelling errors and in complete sentences that are hanging.</p>	<p>However their still lake of knowledge of the environmental effect of tested chemicals. There are many missing links in the causal chain that would connect receptor binding to changes in reproductive health with decreased fertility.</p> <p>The tests were removed by making an incision into the scrotum and fat tissue was cleaned Alder (1984). Then, the tunica was removed and the tubes were transferred into small Petri dishes containing sodium citrate. The tubes were cut up with forceps several times, and then they were mashed on the fly mesh with flat- top forceps. The fluid containing the cells were transferred to 12 x 100 mm round bottom centrifuge tubes, centrifuged at 1000 r.p.m. for 5 min. Supernatant was completely discarded. The hypotonic solution (1% tris-sodium citrate) was slowly added and centrifuged, after 15-20 min., and then the cells were fixed in (methanol and glacial acetic acid, 3:1).The fixation was changed twice after 10 min., for each by centrifugation between changes.</p>
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The write up was poorly written there were several areas where I might say he copied directly from some other works. How can one be doing and experimental work and then stating in his objective that it was a review? How can he be confusing one by stating he used mice but was referring to rats throughout the write up? So many statements that were outside the scope of this study were made by the author.</p> <p>You didn’t state if you had ethical clearance for this number of animals you used for the work. You didn’t also state if you euthanized these mice</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	or rats ? You didn't also state anywhere if animal care guideline and welfare were observed in this study.	
--	--	--