SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_46101**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Prenatal Exposure to Organophosphate Pesticides in Vojvodina**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: 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	**1. The authors measured DAP levels in urine samples collected 3 days postpartum, which represented OP intake of the subjects during hospitalization for delivery. In this sense, it is not the assessment of OP exposure of the subjects in their actual living environment but in hospital.** **Was this the reason why the authors did not analyse any association between urinary DAP levels and biological/life style factors of mothers and the newborn?** **2. No one on the earth are expected not to be exposed to OP pesticides, hence there is no need to emphasize that there is OP exposure in Serbian pregnant women.** **3. Tables 4-7. What is the relevance of comparing the urinary levels of present study and those in Caribbean study in this detailed manner? Generally speaking, comparison with previous studies is just a routine item in a publication but not the main purpose.** **Overall, I cannot see what was the purpose of this study, that can potentially carry any scientific significance. The authors are required to re-define the purpose of this study and re-write the manuscript accordingly.**	1. The authors agree that it would have been better if DAP levels were measured during pregnancy, but this study was initially designed to compare levels of DAP in mothers who delivered healthy boys and boys with undescended testes, so at that time as cryptorchidism could not be diagnosed prenatally, we decided to measure it postpartum. We are currently working on another study where we are analysing association between life style factors of the mother and levels of DAP. 2. The authors understand that every person on the earth is exposed to OP pesticides and therefore Serbia is not an exception, but we wanted to emphasize that although exposure to OP pesticides is assumed our results show relatively high levels of DAP in the urine of mothers shortly after delivery. 3. Thank you for this comment and suggestion. The authors agree that this comparison is too detailed, but it was useful for us to see where Serbia is when comparing DAP levels. We agree that it was too much to mention it all in the manuscript and decided to shorted this comparison.
Minor REVISION comments	No description is given about analytical quality assurance of the authors' method of urinary OP metabolite analysis. The readers need to know precision and trueness of any chemical analyses done in the work.	Thank you for this comment. According to this suggestion we expanded methodology part of the revised manuscript with these subheadings: Chemicals and Materials, Sample Preparation, GC-MS conditions, Detected masses of the analytes, Calibration and quality assurance, Limit of detection
Optional/General comments	Urine samples should have been collected before hospitalization for delivery.	The authors agree that it would have been better if DAP levels were measured during pregnancy, but this study was initially designed to compare levels of DAP in mothers who delivered healthy boys and boys with undescended testes, so at that time as cryptorchidism could not be diagnosed prenatally, we decided to measure it postpartum.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	