

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_97128
Title of the Manuscript:	OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE TO BISPHENOL A (BPA) AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH SERUM TESTOSTERONE, ADIPONECTIN, ESTRADIOL AND INSULIN RESISTANCE
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the data could be beneficial – if the data analysis is severely adjusted. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. No. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaborate on the Calafat study mentioned in the introduction – where were these individuals volunteers at that BPA was found in their urine? • Section 2.1. The length of time workers were exposed is confusing. Since this is clarified in section 2.2, the statement on “who had spent over 10 years or less in the industry” should be omitted in section 2.1. • Section 2.4 – is there a study number given by the ethics committee upon approval of the study? This is something commonly reported with human studies. • I'm not sure that the data presented is accurately analysed. It is hard to believe that a value of 0.05 ± 0.01 is not statistically different from 3.30 ± 1.46. Additionally, did the authors break this out by sex as males and females may metabolize BPA at different rates? • Likewise, serum testosterone and estrogen levels would also be expected to differ greatly between males and females, and even within females depending on age and time within their menstrual cycle. • The authors state a 3 hour range for obtaining blood samples. However, due to the circadian release of cortisol, which peaks in the early morning hours, this time variation may have impacted their data. • Due to the rapid metabolism of BPA, would a metabolite have been more appropriate to examine? Was there variation in the amount of BPA detected and time of day of sampling, if participants were working and exposed the day of their blood draw? • The authors make bold statements in the second full paragraph on pg. 7 that are not fully substantiated by their data. They claim their study offers crucial proof of increased risk of male sexual dysfunction for those exposed to BPA, yet the data presented has nothing to do with sexual function; serum hormone levels are not always a direct indicator of dysfunction. • The authors also try to demonstrate correlation with adiponectin and diabetes risk, yet blatantly state that the hormones examined have opposite effects on the risk of diabetes in men and women. Without subdividing their data by gender, they cannot make any such correlations. • The over-correlation of their data with other physiological disruptions (BPA and estrogen, BPA and metabolism) continues in the remainder of the discussion. <i>These conclusions cannot be made with the way the data is presented!</i> In males, increased estrogenic compounds would decrease endogenous estrogen levels. In females, it depends on the levels and time of cycle. 6. No. There are only 3 references dated after 2010, out of the 45 references listed. Many statements in the introduction and discussion only have a single reference supporting them. 	

Review Form 1.7

	The authors need to update their references – and not just add 2-3 that are in the last year.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are several issues with subject/verb agreement (plural versus singular). These, and other grammatical issues, include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ pg. 1, first sentence of introduction – chemical should be pluralized to chemicals. ○ Pg. 1, same paragraph - environments should be singularized to environment ○ Pg. 2, first paragraph – “Although several studies has revealed” should be “several studies have revealed” ○ Pg. 2, section 2.1 – “individuals who does not work” should be “individuals who do not work” ○ Pg. 3. Participants should not be capitalized. ○ The last 2 sentences in 2.6.3 should be combined as the last sentence is a sentence fragment with a missing parenthesis. ○ Period missing at the end of section 2.7. • Pg. 6. The statement “BPA is does persist in the body; it is metabolized rapidly” is confusing. Please clarify. 	
Optional/General comments	The authors have a valid data set and interesting hypothesis – but the way they have analysed their data is flawed. The data should be re-analysed after separating out males and females, and accounting for age differences in women that could dramatically affect their hormone levels.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jennifer R. Schroeder
Department, University & Country	Millikin University, USA