SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Annual Review & Research in Biology**
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)

- 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	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. 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 organophosporus 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! 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? 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 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. There are several grammatical flaws in the Ms making clarity heinous!	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Dr OO Azu**
Department, University & Country	**Discipline of Clinical Anatomy, School of Laboratory Medicine & Medical Sciences, Nelson R Mandela School of Medicine, Rep of South Africa.**