



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_50383
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiology and clinical profile of male infertility at the Fertilization Centre IRIFIV in Casablanca, Morocco, around 295 Cases.
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- Improve writing in English 2- Abstract: better describe the introduction , methods, results, conclusion 3- Introduction: to better describe data in the literature on male infertility 4- Methods and materials: to better describe all statistical analyses. 5- Results: to better describe the results 6- Discussion: talk about the bias of study; confront the results with the scientific literature	1. English has been improved 2. Introduction, methods, results and conclusion were reviewed 3. the introduction has been reviewed as a whole while taking into account your valuable suggestions 4. Since we only had data, we could only classify them and make graphs of them. We would have done a statistical study with P-Values as in our articles with witnesses and where experiments were carried out. 5. The results have been reviewed to better describe them 6. The discussion has been reviewed as a whole. In the literature, we have found little data and we tried to confront them at best.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	We only used the data from the files. But none the less, we took the precaution of putting a paragraph as though a read and informed consent was submitted to each patient.