

## Review Form 1.6

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Cristóbal Ramírez-Sevilla</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Fundació Hospital Sant Joan de Déu de Martorell, Spain</b>

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_80731</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Succinct Review Article on Male Sterility Diagnosis, Symptoms, and Treatment</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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:

[\(https://www.journalipri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy\)](https://www.journalipri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ General: Too narrow presentation relative to the issue raised male sterility, symptoms and treatment. Three aspects in one, so I think the author need to elaborate the issue based on findings than just putting what is done already.</li> <li>❖ Where is abstract? I could not evaluate it. Pleas insert abstract it is mandatory in any article.</li> <li>❖ I think this (what you called background) should be your abstract, not background. So I suggest, you to standardize this in one paragraph abstract. Start the purpose of this review work and ..... finally conclude your basic review findings. Now the current status is unstandardized, it looks portfolio or lecture presentation note than article. Written statements are random, not easily understandable, unordered, unstructured.</li> <li>❖ The introduction need to be end up with stating the main objectives of this review, but not. I suggest, author include objectives of the review work.</li> <li>❖ I think discussion section is comes in the end of the manuscript than immediately following the introduction. After the introduction, the presentation of different findings on male infertility should be described. Moreover, author need to describe the similarity and differences of different findings shall be presented.</li> <li>❖ Why two type of bracket used [] and () . Please use similar citation style throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>❖ Pleas insert discussion here before the conclusion section. Moreover, you need to have recommendation section: what are going to recommend regarding male infertility and treatment, the psychological aspect of male infertility shall also be discussed in some detail.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dejene Girma Denbel</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dilla University, Ethiopia</b>