

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>               |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_78026  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHUKRA SARA PURUSHA WITH QUALITY OF SEMEN: AN PILOT STUDY |
| Type of the Article      | Short 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>The aim of the present study is novel, but the objectives and methodology lacks depth. The results are inconclusive. The aim of the study is to bridge the traditional medicine with modern medicine i.e. correlation of Shukra datu sara with semen parameters. But the manuscript fails to explain what is the criteria to classify the shukra datu in to uttama, Madhyma and Hina. Today modern medicine is evidence based medicine. All our claims should be supported with strong evidence.</p> <p>Shukra datu sara involves a lot of factors including immunity, fat and many more so there is no clarity in the manuscript regarding this. The methodology part has to be rewritten clearly explaining the selection of subjects and classifying them based on shukra datu sara.</p> <p>In the results part, why sperm viability/ vitality is not analysed, Similarly, sperm morphology is also missing, this is very significant because teratozoospermia is a cause for infertility.</p> <p>The discussion part is written as two sections the first one discussing the traditional method of classification of individuals. The second part discussing the semen parameters. But the authors failed to explain the link between these two. A convincing explanation with solid results is absolutely necessary to defend this.</p> <p>Why the authors have not mentioned or discussed any similar studies done previously.</p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | Table 6,7, 8, in the column heading, what is X,Y, N & r. According to WHO classification the average sperm count per ml is 15 million but in your results the hina which is of poor quality itself is having a sperm count of 26 million, there is no explanation for this.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | The manuscripts needs major revision and has to be completely rewritten.  |   |

**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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | Thotakura Balaji                                   |
| Department, University & Country | Chettinad Academy Of Research And Education, India |