Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_63845**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Ingested foods preheated (using microwave) in plastic containers on the reproductive profile of male albino rats**
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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	• Proofread by a native speaker is highly desirable, since there are many spelling mistakes throughout the entire manuscript. • The authors did not cite other similar works and the particularities of their research. In a quick search, it is possible to find several studies which had analysed similar questions, as Kesari et Benari "Effects of microwave at 2.45 GHz radiations on reproductive system of male rats". • I was not able to find information about the time/temperature binomials of the conventional and microwave processes. It is quite critical to have identical profiles if chemical reactions are being compared, as in the case of release of compounds which cause infertility. If, for example, the time to heat the sample is higher in MW heating, a higher conversion of constituents can be expected and, therefore, the concentrations of hazard compounds is raised.	DONE
Minor REVISION comments	○ ABSTRACT: ○ The phrases "Group I (Negative control) rats were fed *ad libitum* with porridge beans and jellof rice with meat and fish daily for 40 days (not preheated in a microwave). Group II rats were fed *ad libitum* with porridge beans and jellof rice with meat and fish put in a ceramic plate and preheated in a microwave daily for 2 minutes for 40 days. Group III rats were fed *ad libitum* with porridge beans and jellof rice with meat and fish put in plastic containers (not labeled as "microwave safe'') and preheated in a microwave daily for 2 minutes for 40 days." can be rewritten, since the three statements are almost identical. ○ The phrase "Conclusively, it was evident from this study that, foods contained in plastics, preheated in microwave and ingested overtime, may predispose male individuals to dysfunction in their reproductive system which may eventually lead to male infertility." needs to be rewritten. First, it the phrase refers to male individuals can have disfunction problems, while only rats were analyzed. In addition, the sample size is quite small, just 8 rats were analyzed in each experiment, and a lot of variability can be expected in such case. ○ INTRODUCTION ○ In general, the references are not up to date. Take for example the first paragraph, the authors stated that the use of microwave is increasing lately using a reference from 1993. It is highly recommended to use more recent references. ○ The objectives are unclear. The authors cited a lot of works dealing with different questions concerning MW radiation in biological systems and simply state their objective in the sequence. I think that the objective must be rewritten in a separate paragraph exposing the existing literature in sexual concerns of the use of MW radiation, along with a more detailed description of the objective. . ○ RESTULTS AND DISCUSSION ○ Why n = 7 in Table 1? The sample size was not 8? ○ It is important to emphasize that Group I and Group II did not differ in any of the	DONE DONE. HOWEVER, IT WAS A PROBABLE STATEMENT, NOT A CERTAINTY. THAT WAS AN OVERSIGHT. n=8. CORRECTION HAS BEEN MADE

	analysed variables. The authors choose to declare this whenever a new variable is being discussed. I think that is more efficient to remark that in the beginning of the discussions, citing the current literature consensus that MW heating is safe, provided that it was conducted in an appropriate package. ○ Conclusions ○ Why the authors stated that food preheated in ceramics are RELATIVELY safe if none differences were observed? ○ The conclusion is poorly written and need to be fully modified.	IT WAS CLEARLY STATED IN THE DISCUSSION SECTION THAT THERE WAS NO DIFFERENCE IN THE PARAMETERS ANALYSED BETWEEN GROUP I AND GROUP II.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript analysed the effects of two different MW processes in the reproductive profile of rats. Although an interesting subject, some serious revisions must be performed before serious consideration for publication. The authors must update their references, proofread the manuscript, expand their literature revision, describe more accurately the processing conditions and improve the results discussions considering that just a small sample was analyzed.	DONE

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	