

Manuscript: **“Effects of Diabetes Mellitus on the Reproductive System of Adult Male Mice After One Cycle of Spermatogenesis”**

**Submitted: 06 August 2021**

**Accepted: 25 August 2021**

**Published: 30 September 2021**

Corresponding Author: Emile Kouassi Begbin

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n34p149

Peer review:

**Reviewer 1:** Aminu Ibrahim, Bayero University, Kano; Kano State, Nigeria

**Reviewer 2:** Dr.N.K.B.Raju, Sri Venkateswara Veterinary University, India

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

**ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!**

Reviewer Name: AMINU IBRAHIM	
University/Country: Bayero University, Kano; Kano State - Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/08/2021
Manuscript Title: Effects of diabetes mellitus on the reproductive system of adult male mice after one cycle of spermatogenesis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0860/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No <b>YES</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No <b>YES</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No <b>YES</b>	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>IT IS ADEQUATE BECAUSE IT COVERS THE SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>YES</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(ONLY A FEW ERRORS SEEN)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>FAIRLY DETAILED</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>A FEW OBSERVATIONS TO CORRECT</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>A FEW OBSERVATIONS TO CORRECT</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>ECELLENTLY DONE</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): AUTHORS MIGHT CONSIDER TRANSLATING SOME FRENCH REFERENCES INTO ENGLISH.**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr.N.K.B.Raju	Email:nkbraju@gmail.com
University/Country: Sri Venkateswara Veterinary University, India	
Date Manuscript Received:17.08.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 23.08.2021
Manuscript Title: Effects of diabetes mellitus on the reproductive system of adult male mice after one cycle of spermatogenesis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0860/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The title is appropriate, clear and adequate for the study</li> </ul>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstract is relevantly mentioned the background, materials, methods, results and conclusions</li> </ul>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In page no.2 line 18 it is mentioned within the brackets as IDF, 2019 but in ref. section it is mentioned as FID, 2019 please check which is correct</li> <li>In page no.3 line 2 strike off 'with hypogonadism'</li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main problem in this study is the authors did not mention the Institutional Ethical Committee approval Ref./certificate because the study involved experimental animals. Please rectify this remark.</li> <li>In page no.5 line 21 it is mentioned within the brackets as OECD 416, 2001 but in the ref. section it is mentioned as OCDE 416, 2001 please check which is correct</li> </ul>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results are clear and the tables and figures are self explained</li> <li>In page no.14 in discussion section in line no.8 it is mentioned Kopper, 2011 but it is missed in the reference section. Please check it</li> </ul>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conclusions are clear and accurate and were supported by the results</li> </ul>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kopper, 2011 mentioned in the subject is missed in the reference section. Please check it</li> </ul>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b> (accepted based on the results and discussion if they rectify the minor mistakes pointed out and should provide Institutional Ethical Committee approval Ref./certificate. )
<del>Return for major revision and resubmission</del>	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The main problem in this study is you did not mention the Institutional Ethical Committee approval Ref./certificate for this study because it is involved the experimental animals. You should provide Institutional Ethical Committee approval Ref./certificate