



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_65862
Title of the Manuscript:	Reproductive parameters and oxidative stress marker impacts associated with oral and inhalation exposure to Chlorview
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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>I would suggest checking the guidelines for Authors for the correct reference style, e.g:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Oguh CE, Musa AD, Orum TG, Iyaji RO, Musa A. Risk assessment of heavy metals level in soil and jute leaves (<i>corchorus olitorius</i>) treated with azadirachtin neem seed solution and organochlorine. International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology (IJEAB). 2019;4(3): 256-266. <p>Also, the references should be checked throughout the text and the list. For example, reference 1 is Oguh CE., Musa AD., Orum TG., Iyaji R. O. and Musa A. (2019^a). I did not found another reference with the same authors and the same year i.e. Oguh CE., Musa AD., Orum TG., Iyaji R. O. and Musa A. (2019^b).</p> <p>In the Introduction section (page 2, line 23) you said: Milatovic et al^[6], but in the References section Milatovic et al is reference number 3. Please chek it out.</p> <p>Later on, also in the Introduction section (page 2, line 47), you cited Farag et al (2010)^[12], and you said: experiment with rats, but that study was conducted on mice, while the experiments of Farag et al 2003)^[15], were conducted on rats.</p> <p>In the Results and discussion section (page 6, line 28) you said: The decrease in catalase activity observed in this study can be...Catalase activity was actually increased after exposure to Chlorview, as stated before in the same</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>section.</p> <p>In the subsection Inhalation reproductive toxicity (page 7, lines 30-34) you discuss the effects of the administration of chlorpyrifos to male mice on their reproductive parameters, but you cite the study involving human subjects, i.e. reference ^[4]. Please, provide the correct reference. Later, in the same subsection (lines 46-47) you said: The values (of) the sperm count in the present study are still within the limit of normal sperm count reported to be about 40–50 x10⁶/ml ^[36], but reference 36 refers to the human semen characteristics.</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Please, introduce an abbreviation at the first use of the term, e.g. in the Introduction section (page 2, line 23) you mention OP toxicity. I guess OP means organophosphate. If so, please introduce the abbreviation in the line 12, i.e.: The major mechanism of organophosphate (OP) toxicity... In the Results and discussion section (page 6, lines 4 and 15 and page 7, lines 5 and 16) replace Chorview with Chlorview. In the same section (page 7, line 37), please define CPF, or if it means chlorpyrifos, introduce the abbreviation in the Introduction section when the term was first mentioned.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract provides an accessible summary of the paper and the keywords correctly reflect the content of the manuscript. Introduction is well written and clearly outlines recent research related to the subject, highlighting insufficiency in current knowledge. Applied methods are appropriate and well described. Ethical standards were met. The results are well presented and the authors evaluated the trends observed and gave explanation of the significance of their findings. Nevertheless, the text needs a minor language revision by a native English speaker.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vesna Stojiljković
Department, University & Country	Vinča Institute of Nuclear Sciences, University of Belgrade, Serbia