## SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



## **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 |
|--|---|
| 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.            |   |
| 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.                                      |   |
| 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.  |   |
| 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.                     |   |
| 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'.   |   |
| 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 ± SEM or SD?   |   |
| The use of English is still very poor. There are also numerous spelling errors all over      |   |
| the text just like I earlier pointed out.  |   |
|  |   |

Note: Anonymous Reviewer