

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_87721
Title of the Manuscript:	Sever Oligospermia Treatment with Testicular Sperm Using ICSI
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The title of the manuscript should be crafted in such a way that it represents what the author intended to do. What the author presented was 'TREATMENT OF INFERTILITY DUE TO SEVERE OLIGOSPERMIA WITH TESTICULAR SPERM USING ICSI', NOT 'SEVERE OLIGOSPERMIA TREATMENT WITH TESTICULAR SPERM USING ICSI'. The author should address this issue seriously. The abstract is a very important part of an article and should give a summary of the whole manuscript. In this manuscript, the abstract is grossly deficient and lacks a format. There was no mention of the aim/objective of the study, no description of the method(s) used to obtain the information used to write the article. The author should address these issues. Author did not mention the type of review they did; systematic review or just a literature review. It is important this is brought out clearly and appropriately No declaration of conflict of interest. It should be clearly mentioned. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> There were several grammatical errors that should be looked in to and be corrected In-text citation should be uniform. Here, the author brought the numbers before the authors up to number 8; while from 9 to 19, authors were brought before the numbers Citations on Figures should be removed; in-text citations suffice 	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the manuscript was fairly presented. But the author needs to do more to improve its quality.	

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

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aliyu Umar Farinyaro
Department, University & Country	Federal Medical Centre Katsina, Nigeria