

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_120091
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF FERTILITY HORMONES IN TYPE 2 DIABETIC MALE SUBJECTS IN NAUTH, NNEWI.
Type of the 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.journalajrre.com/index.php/AJRRE/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.8](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	The manuscript discusses important findings on the relationship between type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) and male infertility, focusing on the levels of various hormones such as LH, FSH, testosterone, and HbA1c. It also explores the mechanisms through which hyperglycemia can lead to hormonal imbalances and subsequent infertility in males. These topics are indeed important to the scientific community, particularly for endocrinologists, diabetologists, and reproductive health specialists. Furthermore, the manuscript emphasizes the suggestion to include fertility hormonal assays in the routine tests for diabetic males can help improve patient management and outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Evaluation of Fertility Hormones in Type 2 Diabetic Male Subjects in NAUTH, Nnewi" is generally suitable as it conveys the main focus of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, covering the key components of a scientific study: background, aim, methodology, results, and conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate for displaying clarity and coherence, which includes several key sections: Abstract, Background and Aim, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion.	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	While the manuscript is scientifically correct, there are still some aspects that should be considered or clarified to ensure the robustness of the findings: 1) Confounding Factors: The manuscript should account for potential confounding factors such as age, BMI, duration of diabetes, medication use, lifestyle factors, and comorbidities that could influence hormone levels and HbA1c; 2) Statistical Analysis: The manuscript mentions significant correlations but does not detail the statistical methods used (e.g., regression analysis, adjustment for confounders). Providing this information would strengthen the validity of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references of manuscript are sufficient and recent, but, a consistent citation style should be used throughout: with some citations given as numbers (e.g., 1, 2) and others as names (e.g., Berta).	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is almost suitable, but, some aspects can be improved for scholarly communication: 1) Incorrect or Inconsistent Terminology: Terms like "heamoglobin" should be corrected to "hemoglobin," and consistent use of medical terminology is necessary; term "intrasticular" appears to be a misspelling or incorrect term. It should be "intratesticular." 2) Fragmented Sentences: Some sentences are fragmented or lack clarity. For example, "Also reports by Al hayek et al reported low serum levels of testosterone and elevated levels of LH in male diabetic subjects15."	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.8

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xin Huang
Department, University & Country	Sichuan University of Science & Engineering, P.R. China