



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_45068
Title of the Manuscript:	A comparative Evaluation Of Selected Medicinal Plants For Possible Use As Male Anti Infertility Agents. An Animal Case Study.
Type of the 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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Title</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Replace “evaluation” in the title with “effects”2. The title doesn't have point (.) at the end <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. The abstract is not well punctuated, points and commas are poorly used.4. Some sentences are too long and incomprehensible with disastrous English. E.g “From the research ,it was shown that theconcentration of sex hormones measured in the male rats fed with medium plants (seeds) showed that the testosterone concentration showed significant increase (p<0.05) in animal control group 1(normal rats) while the concentration of the hormone in group 2(ketoconazole) induced animals with no treatment) significantly decreased (p<0.05) when compared across the treatment groups 3-10(induced rats fed with 4g,8gand 12g/kg between(bw) day of the test samples).”5. The keywords should be in alphabetic order <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. The references in the text are misused, you must review how to use the references in the text when it is one author, two and more than two. <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. How do you share 90 male rats to 11 groups each of 6 males and 4 females (10)?8. Why the female rats while the work is typically based on male rats?9. Since the treated male rats were not used to fertilize untreated females to better appreciate their fertility, this work is unfinished because it was the key.10. Why use Arabic and Roman numerals to design your controls? you can call them negative and positive control.11. Bring out the methodology for collecting sperm of the rat.12. Specify the microscope magnification for reading the spermatozoa characteristics.13. The statistical test and software used for data analysis are missing in the methodology.14. (g) "Determination of testicular histology" why the liver in the text? what is the relationship with fertility?15. What is the relationship between the estradiol and the fertility of the male rats? <p>Results</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">16. How can you use only reproductive hormones and sperm characteristics to assess animal fertility? increase your parameters.17. The tables are poorly presented with parameters without units of measure	<p>Authors very much appreciate the comments of the reviewers. We tried to improve the quality of the manuscript based on the thoughtful comments of the reviewers.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>18. The discussion of the results is completely absent</p> <p>19. It is more interesting to determine the relative weight of the reproductive organs instead of reproductive organs weight.</p> <p>20. The results on the testes histology are absent.</p> <p>21. Standardizes the writing of authors' names in the reference section.</p> <p>22. Reformulate the conclusion, English is very poor.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>I have reviewed the manuscript entitle: "A comparative Evaluation of Selected Medicinal Plants for Possible Use as Male Anti Infertility Agents. An Animal Case Study" The experimental design and the methods used in the work is not well understood. the authors used only reproductive hormone and sperm characteristics to appreciate the male rat fertility. Also, the discussion of the result is completely absent.</p>	