



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Improve writing in English</li> <li>2- Abstract: better describe the introduction , methods, results, conclusion</li> <li>3- Introduction: to better describe data in the literature on male infertility</li> <li>4- Methods and materials: to better describe all statistical analyses.</li> <li>5- Results: to better describe the results</li> <li>6- Discussion: talk about the bias of study; confront the results with the scientific literature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. English has been improved</li> <li>2. Introduction, methods, results and conclusion were reviewed</li> <li>3. the introduction has been reviewed as a whole while taking into account your valuable suggestions</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. The results have been reviewed to better describe them</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	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.