



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	2014_ARRB_13573
Title of the Manuscript:	SHORT TERM EFFECTS OF ENERGY DRINK ON SPERM MORPHOLOGY, HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETRES AND BEHAVIOUR OF ADULT MALE MICE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Line 25-30: What are the references?</p> <p>Line 47: What are the references? It needs more information. This citation makes part of the focus of this study;</p> <p>Line 48-54: It's confused. It needs clarification.</p> <p>Line 61-66: The objectives of the study were not well supported by introduction;</p> <p>Line 87-95: Consumption was not measured?</p> <p>Line 97-100: The methods were poorly described. It needs more clarification. Besides, how many mice were euthanized in each week?</p> <p>Line 116-118: The methods were poorly described. It needs more clarification;</p> <p>Line 120-122: This statistical analysis is not suitable. Authors should consider using ANOVA with Dunnett's test. Significance level was not described. Change SD for SEM;</p> <p>Line 125-139: In all plates it is not possible to see what is described in text. All of them should be changed;</p> <p>Line 168: Table 4, in this case the t test should be performed;</p> <p>Line 180: Table 5; what are these movements? How are they evaluated? Besides, change SD for SEM. Table should be self-explanatory;</p> <p>Line 191-195: The substances cited by authors are not components of the Red Bull®; so, this citation does not support the findings of this study. Authors should provide more relevant information;</p> <p>Line 198-201: The duration of the mice spermatogenic cycle should be cited;</p> <p>Line 203-207: It needs references. What drug toxicity? What caused anaemia? Authors did not discuss about their findings;</p> <p>Line 207-208: No statistical test was applied to affirm that;</p> <p>Line 209-214: This citation does not support any finding of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 27-28: Put dosage in mg/l. Also, change "cup" for ml;</p> <p>Line 39: term "5448US" needs clarification;</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 45-46: It seems to be contradictory; Line 71: Delete "(in the same Laboratory)"; Line 87-88: Delete "groups"; Line 97: Change "sacrificed" for "euthanized"; Line 126-128: It is confused. It needs clarification; Line 131-132: Change "\leq" for "<". Correct everywhere; Line 145: Table 2, change SD for SEM. How the count was performed? Line 148-151: Repetition of the information in Table 3; Line 159: Table 3, change SD for SEM; Line 173: It is confused and needs to be rewritten; Line 174: Delete "group"; Line 189-190: References? Line 215-216: What drug the authors are referring to? Line 217-219: Delete the paragraph. It is not related to the focus of the study; Line 221-223: Repetition of information that was described in Results; Line 223-224: I'm not sure if results support this affirmation; Line 226: change "lb" for "Kg"; Line 233: Female mice were not the focus of the study. Thus, this statement may be deleted; Line 237-240: Results of this study do not allow to affirm that; Line 272-273: In the text is "Serfert"; however, in the reference list is "Seifert".</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General comments</u></p>	<p>The authors carried out a study to investigate the possible side effect of energy drink on diverse health related issues in general and reproductive outcome in particular. The proposal has scientific value; however, the results were not well exposed. Methodology appears to be suitable; however, it was not well described. Besides, statistical analysis applied to data was not appropriate, which reduces validity of the results. Authors also did not clarify the objectives, i.e. mutagenic effects were cited in Abstract as an aim of the study; however, the applied methodology was not suitable for achieving this objective.</p> <p>Frequently, authors missed the point along discussion, citing articles with irrelevant information for the present study. Besides, discussion was frequently based on findings of other articles.</p> <p>I suggest the authors: to rewrite entire article; to clarify the objectives; to</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	correct statistical analysis; and to discuss their own results.	
--	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Brazil