



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>)



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>The theme is important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: Please avoid to use parenthesis. 2. Figure 2: you use French. "Year" should be used instead of "an". 3. Men sometimes "hide" the fact that he had child(ren) and thus whether he suffered primary or secondary sterility is not confirmed: please state this meaning. 4. Table 2: Avoid to use French. Please use English. 5. I understand that you described the situation of the male infertility in your area. An original article should have something "new" even though it is very tiny. Please more clearly state the "new" point that your study showed here. If your data is only a reconfirmation of preexisting knowledge, then, please state so. In the latter occasion, the next sentences may be useful. "Although the present data is in general accordance with that of preexisting studies and there are no, or little, brand new data, describing the area-specific information may contribute to the better health/policy making and better education". 6. I understand also French (English, French, and Germany). You sometimes use French or French-like English. Please ask some English native to edit this manuscript. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the parentheses, it was to quote the parameters in a detailed way. 2. Figure 2: It was an oversight on my part but we changed them 3. we changed the reformulation to make more explicit 4. The table2 has been changed 5. you have understood everything. Thank the paragraph suggested. Moreover We could have changed a lot of things for a clear improvement 6. The manuscript has been revised as a whole to improve its English...
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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	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.