

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_121095
Title of the Manuscript:	THE PHYSIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ENDOCRINE DISTRUPTORS IN REPRODUCTION: A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Like :The problem is a hot topic in today's world, impacting a population that is both active and economically productive. It has significant, immediate effects on society, the economy, and psychology. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the issue while taking into account regional, economic, social, and customary differences. The review will aid in the scientific community's understanding of the issue and support future policy decisions at different levels. Dislike : Poorly drafted. No clarity of thought.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Endocrine disruptors : Is it a modern day menace for reproductive health?	Title revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	There is repetition of definition of endocrine disruptors in the abstract. Abstract is very poorly drafted. Does not reflect any overview of problem statement, overview and hint toward the conclusion. Need to be rewritten. Authors commented only about US. It is not clear whether authors are not interested in global problem status.	ok
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<div>1. Please modify the definition of 'endocrine disruptors'. It should include a. whether they are natural or artificial/human made b.whether it only interfere or may can mimic or block the action of hormones. Kindly mention the standard definition source from reputed agency like USEPA etc.</div> <div>2. The study is related to human species and human species are unique in various aspects. There are no dearth of human studies on this topic. Therefore it is requested to avoid 'Most species of animals possess the endocrine system' or animal studies reference where human studies are available.</div> <div>3. Poorly drafted and few spelling mistakes are there like 'female rats in a dose system' 'that endocrine disruptors' "thyroid gland of female rates" 'degree of anomaly'. 'telarche occurs' 'x-chromosome'</div> <div>4. Entire paragraph of 'dose response curve' need to be rewritten for clarity of thoughts.</div> <div>5. The line need to be rewritten'The availability and the <b>degree of anomaly</b> common to DES sons and daughters differ greatly depending on'</div> <div>6. 'Endocrine disrupting chemicals are classified thus: According to their usage (e.g pesticides) According to its structural properties as→ steroids, → polyaromatic hydrocarbons'... Kindly elaborate further.</div> <div>7. Please highlight how individual compound affect reproductive endocrine system.</div>	<div>Noted and revised</div> <div>Revision made</div> <div>Corrected Done</div>

Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The article is poorly drafted. The flow of article is not smooth. There is no chart /diagram /table explaining the review with contradictory thoughts. It is repeatedly mentioned in article that the findings are till not confirmed definitely. But why the definite proof is not generated is not highlighted in the flow process of article.</p>	<p>ok</p>
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>If possible increase more references from 2015 onwards period.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are many grammatical and spelling error.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Endometriosis need to be incorporated. Article need to be modified in line of proper review article in this field eg ‘Diamanti-Kandarakis E, Bourguignon JP, Giudice LC, Hauser R, Prins GS, Soto AM, Zoeller RT, Gore AC. Endocrine-disrupting chemicals: an Endocrine Society scientific statement. Endocr Rev. 2009 Jun;30(4):293-342.</p>	

PART 2:

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