

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_110981
Title of the Manuscript:	POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTION OF EXPOSURE TO INSECTICIDE USED IN NIGERIA TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DYSLIPIDAEMIA AND HORMONAL DISORDER IN MALE AND FEMALE ALBINO WISTER RATS
Type of the Article	

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. It should be rewritten in terms of English grammar and writing	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Write the title more carefully. For example, the desired country should be mentioned in the last part.</p> <p>2. Focus on results and Conclusion rather methods in Abstract.</p> <p>3. Correct the spaces between words and lines.</p> <p>4. The method of measuring hormones should be explained more precisely</p> <p>5. In the case of male rats, it is better that sperm and tissue parameters were checked. In the case of female rats, the histology of ovarian follicles was considered</p> <p>6. There is no data analysis method.</p> <p>7. Groups should be better explained.</p> <p>8. p-value should be better explained.</p> <p>9. The mean \pm S.E.M or Mean \pmSD???</p> <p>10. Hormonal results in groups do not seem logical. Check again.</p> <p>11. The discussion is very poorly written. The results should be compared with previous studies and the signaling pathway should be explained.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahil Jannatifar
Department, University & Country	Academic Center for Education Culture and Research, Iran