Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Volume 22 · Issue 2 · e147186

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Lead Acetate Provokes Poor Sperm Quality and Reduced Sperm Concentration in Male Wistars Rats

Oyedayo Phillips Akano, Olumide Stephen Akinsomisoye, Deborah Doyin Alade, Sidqout Yetunde Akinsanya

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
22 Mar 2024	20 Jun 2024	20 Jun 2024	10.5812/amh-147186

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

4 comments · 3 Apr 2024 – 4 Jun 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 3 Apr 2024

Comments to the Author:
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there is much room for further improvement, which the authors should consider. The following points are of concern, and major suggestions are indicated below. Several important questions were asked, especially in the methods and results sections.
1- Several mistakes further hamper the overall quality of the manuscript, and the authors should consider the STROBE checklist in order to improve their manuscript. The marked and completed STROBE checklist should be submitted as a supplementary file for review.
Introduction:
2- This section was too long. It should be presented in one or two paragraphs (not 2-3 pages!!!). The first paragraphs should be summarized. The background should summarize the purpose and the rationale for the study.
Please remove content unrelated to the title and aims of the research.
3- Also, the introduction should include a better presentation of the main rationale of the study and emphasize the limitations of previous studies.
4- What new question do the findings of this study answer? Many studies have been done in this regard. Why did the authors decide to conduct this study again?
5- What was the novelty of your research? Please define it precisely and clearly.
Methods
6- Did they use any kind of advertisement or incentive? It is not clear how the authors provided these markers for the study. Did the patients purchase them, or did the authors provide the markers? If the 2nd scenario is valid, who covered the cost? If there is company support, this must be mentioned.
7- Again, the main outcome measures and the statistical analysis methods used to obtain them should be noted briefly but precisely.
Results
8- The study relies on crude data analysis to draw the main conclusion. To strengthen the validity of the findings and account for potential confounding factors, it's advisable to employ regression models. Multivariate regression analysis can help adjust for various confounders, making the results more robust and reliable.
9- We avoid relying solely on statistical hypothesis testing, such as p values, which fail to convey important information about effect size and the precision of estimates. The findings expressed as the odds ratio (OR) with a 95% confidence interval and p values were not presented alone.
Discussion
10- It was not organized. We would prefer to write the aim or the title of an article as the first line, and in the second and third lines, we must mention the main finding(s). For the rest of this part, any gap, question, or hypothesis should be stated, followed by references to other studies.
11- Any limitations and recommendations must be included in the last paragraph of the discussion, and any gap, question, hypothesis, or comment should be stated in the last paragraph.
12- The clinical statement of the study should be expressed in more detail.
Conclusions:
13- It was not justified and needs complete revision. This section did not need references. Please express the conclusion based on the actual findings of the study.

References:
14- More than 80% of references were published before 2010 and need updating. Almost all references were very old (before 2000). Please cite new research on this subject.

thanks

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 4 Jun 2024

1. Add statistical analysis (ANOVA, ...) to the Abstract.
2. The conclusion needs to be edited both in the abstract and in the body of the manuscript. It should focus on results. This part should not have references.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 4 Jun 2024

major revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 4 Jun 2024

Major revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to reviewer’s comments

Reviewer 1

Comments to the Author:
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there are many rooms for further improvement which the authors should consider. The following points are of concern and major suggestions are marked in the following. Several important questions were asked, especially in the methods and results sections.
1- Several mistakes further hamper the overall quality of the manuscript and the authors should be considered checklist (STROBE) in order to improve their manuscript. The marked and fulfilled STROBE Checklist should be submitted by supplementary file for review.
Introduction:
2- This section was so long. It should be expressed in one or two paragraph (not 2-3 pages!!!). The first paragraphs should be summarized. The background should summarize the purpose and the rationale for the study.
Pl removes unrelated content to title and aims of research.
3- Also the introduction should include a better representation of the main rationale of the study and emphasis on the limitations of previous studies.
4- Which new question does the findings of this study answer? Many studies have been done in this regard. Why the authors decided to conduct this study again?
5- What was the novelty of your research? Pl defines it precise and clear.
Methods
6- Did they use any kind of advertisement / incentive? It is not clear how the authors provided these markers to the study. Did the patients purchase them or did the authors provide the markers? If the 2nd scenario is valid, who sponsored the cost of that? If there is a company support, this issue must be mentioned.
7- Again, the main outcome measures and statistical analyses methods to arrive those should be noted briefly but precise.
Results
8- The study relies on crude data analysis to draw the main conclusion. To strengthen the validity of the findings and account for potential confounding factors, it's advisable to employ regression models. Multivariate regression analysis can help adjust for various confounders, making the results more robust and reliable.
9- We avoid relying solely on statistical hypothesis testing, such as P values, which fail to convey important information about effect size and precision of estimates. The findings expressed with the Odds Ratio (OR) at Confidence Interval 95% and p values were not presented alone.
Discussion
10- It was not organized. We would rather to write the aim or the title of an article as the first line, and in the second and third lines we must mention the main(s) finding(s) and for the rest of this part, any gap, question, hypothesis should be declared and then allude to other studies.
11- Any limitation and recommendation must be inputted in last paragraph of

discussion and in last paragraph any gap, question, hypothesis or comment should be declared.
12- The clinical statement of study should be expressed in more details.
Conclusions:
13- It was not justified and need revision, totally. this section did not need references. Pl expressed the conclusion based of real finding of the study.
References:
14- More than 80 % of references were before 2010 and need renewal. Almost references were very old (before 2000). Pl cites new researches about this subject.

Response to reviewer 1

Thank you for your thoughtful comments on the submitted work. However, it appears there may be a misunderstanding. The research Reviewer 1 was referencing in their review doesn't seem to align with the work we submitted.

*It's possible there's been a mix-up. To clarify, our work is titled "**Lead Acetate Provokes Poor Sperm Quality and Reduced Sperm Concentration in Male Wistars Rats**". We appreciate your time and look forward to your feedback on our research.*

Response to reviewer 2

Reviewer 2:
1. Add statistical analysis (ANOVA,...) in to the Abstract.

Response: A statement has been added to convey the message

"Statistical analysis was performed using ANOVA with significance set at $p < 0.05$, using GraphPad Prism 8".

2. The conclusion needs to be edited both in the abstract and in the body of the manuscript. It should focus on results. This part should not be have references.

The conclusion has been restructured both in the abstract and the main article. The references have been removed completely.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 20 Jun 2024

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 20 Jun 2024

The conclusion in the Abstract and at the end of the Discussion is long. It should be derived from your own research and summarized in one paragraph of fewer than 60 words.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response

EIC Decision:

The conclusion in the Abstract and end of Discussion is long. It should be raised from your own research and should be summarized in one paragraph and less than 60 words

Response: The conclusion has been revised both in the abstract and the main article.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 20 Jun 2024

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 20 Jun 2024

Accept