OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijem.101776
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(3); e101776

Peer Review Report for "Potential Adverse Effects of Female and Male Obesity on Fertility: A Narrative Review"

Author(s): Mina Amiri, Fahimeh Ramezani Tehrani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 15 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Sep 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Sima Nazarpour: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
In this review study entitled “Potential adverse effects of female and male obesity on fertility: A narrative review”, the authors summarized the potential adverse effects of female and male obesity as well as the impact of weight loss on their fertility status. It is a well-written review study with an interesting subject that could answer the conflicting results of the literature. However, this study has some concerns which should be addressed before publication. Following are my comments for the authors:
• In the keywords section, please use the words obesity and weight separately instead of obesity / overweight
• Please define the terms of “obesity” and its classification.
• In Method section, it is suggested to mention the number of studies reviewed and also selected for the study.
• Please correct the word “Fecund ability”” to “Fecundability” in the Evidence Acquisition section.
• It is recommended that you use “Reproductive outcome” OR “Reproductive” as a keyword in your search.
• Please use the full name of terms and then abbreviation when it firstly appears in the text and also it should be the same in whole article. For example: Poly cystic ovarian syndrome

(PCOS), Luteinizing hormone (LH), Body mass index (BMI), Assisted reproductive technology (ART), In vitro fertilization (IVF) and Intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI).

• All abbreviated terms used in the tables should be defined in the footnote. for example: LH, SHBG in table 1 and 2.

• It is suggested to mention the strengths and limitations of the study at the end of the discussion.

• What further studies are recommended in this area?

Thanks.

Sedigheh Hosseini: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Sep 2020

Dear AE,

The authors should check the written format.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript needs minor revision before it can be accepted for publication in the IJEM.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Sep 2020

Dear Author,

Based on the reviewers comments the manuscript needs revision.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

09-14-2020

Dear Editors

Greetings

Thank you so much for your email dated 10-September-2020, regarding the evaluation of our manuscript entitled "*Potential adverse effects of female and male obesity on fertility: A narrative review- MS ID: 101776"* and the opportunity to revise the manuscript. We have carefully considered all editorial office and reviewers comments and hereby submit a revised version, with all changes highlighted in the text. We hope our revisions meet your expectations and that you find the revised manuscript suitable for publication.

Looking forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience,

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Fahimeh Ramezani Tehrani

Professor of Obstetrics & Gynecology,

Director, Reproductive Endocrinology Research Center,

Research Institute for Endocrine Sciences,

Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

P.O. Box: 19395-476

Phone: +98-21-22432500

Fax: +98-21-2241626

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

C. Please check written format.

R. *Thank you for your valuable comment. We have carefully checked and edited the manuscript.*

Reviewer 2:

General comment: In this review study entitled “Potential adverse effects of female and male obesity on fertility: A narrative review”, the authors summarized the potential adverse effects of female and male obesity as well as the impact of weight loss on their fertility status. It is a well-written review study with an interesting subject that could answer the conflicting results of the literature. However, this study has some concerns which should be addressed before publication. Following are my comments:

R: *Thank you so much for you acknowledgment and positive feedback. We have carefully considered all your comments and hereby submit a revised version, with all changes highlighted in the text.*

C1. In the keywords section, please use the words obesity and weight separately instead of obesity / overweight.

R: *Thank you. Revised as suggested. We have selected all keywords based on the MESH terms.*

C2. Please define the terms of “obesity” and its classification.

R: *Thank you for this comment. We have added the definition of obesity and its classifications to introduction as follows:*

"Obesity, a common metabolic disturbance, is defined as an abnormal or excessive accumulation of body fat [1]. According to the current guidelines from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the world health organization (WHO), a body mass index (BMI) ≥ 25 kg/m2 is considered to be overweight, and a BMI ≥ 30 kg/m2 is classified as obese, with severe obesity defined as a BMI ≥ 40 kg/m2."

C3: In Method section, it is suggested to mention the number of studies reviewed and also selected for the study.

R: Thank you for this comment. We did not report a search results section, since this study is a narrative review. However, according to this recommendation, we added the following sentences to the first paragraph of the results:

"Of 240,000 records retrieved by searching the databases, a total of 68 relevant studies were selected for this review. We firstly summarized the results of studies investigating the associations between male/ female obesity and reproduction. Then, we discussed the effects of female/ male obesity on the assisted reproductive technology. Finally, the influences of the weight reduction on female/ male fertility were discussed."

C4: Please correct the word "Fecund ability"" to "Fecundability" in the Evidence Acquisition section.

R: *Thank you. Corrected as suggested.*

C5: It is recommended that you use "Reproductive outcome" OR "Reproductive" as a keyword in your search.

R: *All keywords are selected based on the MESH terms. We have added "Reproductive" to keywords list.*

C6: Please use the full name of terms and then abbreviation when it firstly appears in the text and also it should be the same in whole article. For example: Poly cystic ovarian syndrome (PCOS), Luteinizing hormone (LH), Body mass index (BMI), Assisted reproductive technology (ART), In vitro fertilization (IVF) and Intracytoplasmic sperm injection (ICSI).

R: *Done as suggested.*

C7: All abbreviated terms used in the tables should be defined in the footnote. For example: LH, SHBG in table 1 and 2.

R: *All abbreviations were defined in the footnotes of tables.*

C8: It is suggested to mention the strengths and limitations of the study at the end of the discussion.

R: *According to this comment, we have added the following strengths and limitations to the discussion section:*

"The main strengths of this study were the relatively large number of studies reviewed, and assessing the diverse effects of obesity on fertility in both male and female populations. However, this review has some limitations that should be considered. First, a limited number of studies have been assessed the effects of obesity on male infertility, with controversial results. Second, most studies reviewed for the study were conducted on individuals undergoing ART, and there were no enough studies to explain the association between obesity and fertility in the general populations. Finally, there were insufficient data on reproduction outcomes in obese donor oocyte/ sperm recipients."

C9: What further studies are recommended in this area?

R: We have added the following sentence to the last paragraph discussion:

"Therefore, further well designed studies are needed to address the effects of male and female obesity on reproduction in different populations, in particular in obese donor oocyte/ sperm recipients."

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 19 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
The editorial and reviewer concerns have been satisfactorily answered. This article is accepted.
Thanks.