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General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Figure 1 is mis-labelled: A<B, and C are without beads, unlike the legend indicates.
I am intrigued why the authors failed to consider a couple possible explanations:
1) they were using the wrong model. Since 16 day old Sertoli cells have never phagocytosed anything, would it be possible that using cells from an older animal would show an effect?
   It would have been good to have a reference supporting the use of latex beads as a good model for phagocytosis.
   Did the authors try applying residual bodies instead of beads? This might have elicited a better response from the cells.
   Since it was never stated in the MS, the reader is left presuming that the beads retained in the immunochemical plates are INSIDE the Sertoli cells... is this true? Was there any reason you could not count them (using a bead sorter or some such) to help quantify an effect (or lack thereof)?
   Finally, it would have been useful to have also stained actin fibers, so verify that SOME component of the cell was responding to these beads, and that such a change was at least detectable.
   On the plus side, they DID expect that FSH would alter the kinetics or final value of the phagocytosis process... although whether this was achieved is hard to determine.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept without revision
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Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.