



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Review &amp; Research in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	2013_ARRB_4925
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Spermatogenic Alterations Induced by Organophosphorus Compounds Profenofos, Chlorpyrifos and Synthetic Pyrethroid Lambada-cyhalothrin in Mice</b>

**PART 2:**

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The revised paper is a little improvement from the previous one. However, there is still so much to be done to this manuscript before it can be published on any journal. Virtually everything pointed out was not effected by the authors. The abstract and the entire results and discussion has to be rewritten if possible by a superior scientist in your institution, this is because it is like the authors don't understand the concept of the work that was carried out. I thought I could help the authors with some corrections but I discovered it's like the entire write up needs to be done again. The statistics is faulty or was not done at all, the photomicrograph as I pointed out before was not well labelled (they should tell exactly what the abnormality is) and the English language used in the write up is terrible. There was this statement made in the manuscript that was repeated "further support for testicular toxicity comes from studies in laboratory mice that showed associations between exposure tested pesticides and sperm shape abnormalities, as well as dose-response relationships between exposure and a decline in epididymal sperm count and motility and increased abnormal sperm" in the abstract lines 37-42, in the introduction and lines 151-154 in the results and discussion. What was that for? I also feel the authors should either take one of the pesticides studied and do a thorough work or take two of them instead of taking too much and doing little or nothing. There were too many unnecessary statements in the manuscript, spelling errors and wrong quotations. Why did you sacrifice the control mice when nothing was administered to it, not even the vehicle used in the constitution of the pesticides? This is totally unacceptable. The LD<sub>50</sub> that was used for the pesticides where was it gotten from? It should be stated whether it was determined by the authors or someone in their institution or environment determined it? Same with the ADI, the source should be referenced. There are so many queries that need to be answered in this manuscript.</p>	<p><b>Dear editor, peer reviewer thank you in advance for your great effort</b></p> <p>The abstract, results and discussion (were done)</p> <p>photomicrograph labelled (was done)</p> <p>statement repeated (was done)</p> <p>spelling errors and wrong quotations (were done)</p> <p>control mice used for comparison with treatment</p> <p>LD<sub>50</sub> and ADI for tested pesticides from (pesticides manual 2010)</p>