



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>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The authors have made a comparison on the affect of male and female infertility on the psycho emotional balance of a couple, where the authors have opined that male infertility has profound affects on this balance, please quote a reference for this <p>Patients and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 52 – 57 – Please write as paragraphs and not as points - Line 64 – Please mention the edition and year (2010) of semen analysis and add a reference for the same - Normal semen analysis values – Please write as a descriptive passage and not as points (and this is not at all required because the authors have already mentioned that they have used WHO 2010 criteria) - Line 73 – what is motility at 4am ? <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fig 2 – what is ans ? - Oligospermia and teratospermia – these are outdated terminologies, please use the terminologies as enshrined in the WHO manual of 2010 which is ologozoospermia and teratozoospermia - <p>Secondary male infertility vs. Secondary infertility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secondary infertility is described for the couple whereas secondary male infertility is proved case of infertility in a previously fertile male (please use these cautiously in line 92 and 93) - <p>Abbreviations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no need to mention abbreviations at the end, please mention the full forms as they appear in the text <p>Discrepancies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the methods section the authors have mentioned about several parameters like culture, endocrine workup and deferensograpgy, but the results section have no mention of these parameters - Retrospective study vs. Semen was collected (Prospective) <p>Objective of the Study vs. Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No coherence between the proposed research question and the conclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A reference has been added in this part - This part has been written in paragraph -Line 64 - The edition and year (2010) of sperm analysis and add a reference for the same were added. -Normal values of sperm analysis - a descriptive run was written and the points removed. -It was mobility after 4am. Moreover, it was part of the points you suggested me to delete. -It was an oversight on the part. I changed it. -These words have been changed. -These lines have been reviewed. -The abbreviations have been removed -All the parameters are now mentioned in the discussion. In fact, there was non-exploitable data in the files - This part has been deleted. You are right -I tried to revisit the proposed research question as well as the conclusion
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 23, 24 – please use regular English terms for spermogram, spermoculture and deferensograpgy - such terms may reduce the visibility and citation of the paper - Line 31 – please restructure appropriately <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 44 – paraclinical / laboratory <p>Methods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The appropriate terms spermogram, spermoculture and deferentography were used -Line 31 - Appropriate restructuring made - the line has been revised -This word is not the right one. It was deferentography



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 57 – defertility ? <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please write the figure number above the figure - Counting in patients with varicocoele – Sperm count in Varicocoele <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several grammatical errors need to be addressed 	<p>- Actually, there is no number because the title was not good. So I changed it -It's been reviewed</p> <p>-The discussion has been reviewed. Besides, I had to redo it and added the data of the other parameters.</p>
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is mandatory to line number the manuscript before submission, the authors have not done the same in accordance with the journal's protocol hence the manuscript had to be line numbered before review, find the line numbered manuscript for reference. 	<p>-The manuscript has been numbered</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Ethical Clearance not mentioned</p>	<p>we only used the data from the files. However, we took the precaution of mentioning a paragraph in which informed and informed consent was given to each patient.</p>