



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Annual Review & Research in Biology
Manuscript Number:	2013_ARRB_4925
Title of the Manuscript:	Spermatogenic Alterations Induced by Organophosporus Compounds Profenofos, Chlorpyrifos and Synthetic Pyrethroid Lambada-cyhalothrin in Mice

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The authors still don't understand most of the comments I made. My advice is that they give this manuscript to a senior colleague to help them with. Or they should cut down on the number of pesticide used and pick one or two of them and do justice to it.</p> <p>The abstract is a little fair, but the state in the results section of the abstract "further support for testicular toxicity comes from studies in laboratory albino mice that showed association..... And increased abnormal sperm" should be completely expunged from the abstract.</p> <p>The discussion just as I mentioned in my previous assessments needs to be re-discussed. The authors did not discuss the result but instead were discussing other authors work with details as if it were their work.</p> <p>The source of the ADI and LD50 should be stated in your methodology. Moreover, they were supposed to determine the LD50 for this study because LD50 is not a biological constant, it varies from environment to environment and time to time. And so it was wrong for them to base their work on an LD50 from pesticide manual 2010.</p> <p>The morphological abnormalities the authors were trying to depict in there photomicrographs should be stated indicating the exact abnormality they want to show us and not just saying 'photomicrograph of mice sperm morphology induced by profenofos, chlorpyrios or lambdacyhalothrin'.</p> <p>I still have a problem with your results in table 2 and 3. Were statistics carried out on these values? If yes, what type of statistical analysis and also why were they not represented in mean \pm SEM or SD?</p> <p>The use of English is still very poor. There are also numerous spelling errors all over the text just like I earlier pointed out.</p>	<p>Dear editor, peer reviewer thank you in advance for your great effort</p> <p>The correction are highlighted in red colour.</p> <p>The abstract, results and discussion (were done)</p>