



**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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Manuscript describes the effects of organophosphate compounds on testicular spermatogenic morphology and motility in an animal model to depict likely effects on humans. This is a topical issue of interest to andrologists and reproductive health experts as well to the agricultural sector in view of the implication of pesticides to human/animal reproductive health.</p> <p>However, in the present format of the manuscript, there are a lot of queries which diminishes the weight of the data presented; Title is misleading..there is no justification for 'reproductive toxicity' by mere sperm structure/motility assessment. Was there a mating test carried out to check if these sperm cells were actually not capable of fertilisation? I rather suggest authors amend to the title "spermatogenic alterations induced by organophosphorus compounds profenofos, chlorpyrifos in mice". In the same vein, teratogenicity studies carried out are merely examination of nuclei as stained in sections. This is not enough to conclude succinctly!</p> <p>The method section is unclear and appears very tardy in description; how were the sperm cells sampled, was it from whole testis or epididymis? This was not stated? And why the choice of whole testis tissue?</p> <p>They are lots of ambiguous statements that authors just parroted , eg, see concluding paragraph (page 3)... ...'Finally, we can conclude that tested pesticides can cause male reproductive system abnormalities that include reduced sperm production and/or fertilizing capability.'...this is unacceptable in the basis of this</p>	<p><b>Dear editor, peer reviewer thank you in advance for your great effort</b></p> <p>"spermatogenic alterations induced by organophosphorus compounds profenofos, chlorpyrifos in mice".</p> <p>spermatogenic alterations induced by organophosphorus compounds profenofos, chlorpyrifos and synthetic pyrethroid lambda-cyhalothrin in mice</p> <p>I suggest this title because I used lambda-cyhalothrin and it was not mentioned in your suggestion</p> <p>This methods after Alder (1984), because it is an easy method which gives clear and rapid data, in comparison of the other methods.</p> <p>Finally, we can say that this is a preliminary work that shows some abnormalities in sperm structure, motility and nuclei morphology, and we suggest some important future studies; whole male reproductive organs sampled</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>preliminary work which just shows sperm structure, motility and nuclei morphology! Safe the testis, there were no other male reproductive organs sampled, no fertility tests done. This conclusion is therefore burgoos and must be redone in line with data presented.</p> <p>There are several grammatical flaws in the Ms making clarity heinous!</p>	<p>fertility tests must be done, to give a full picture of the caused male reproductive system abnormalities can be done using tested pesticides.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		