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Comments to Author

The manuscript has improved but still needs a thorough review in some aspects.

Aspects of writing should be reviewed. For example, abbreviations should be indicated the first time they appear in the text and then must be used. The abbreviation cannot appear in some paragraphs and in others the complete term. The same structure should be followed throughout the document.

The citation of authors should be reviewed in the text. In some places it appears with the year in brackets, in others without brackets and in others the year does not appear.

Review carefully how to cite authors in text according to the journal rules.

The manuscript should be carefully reviewed so that it can be published.

I think it should review certain points listed below.

Abstract

1) The most relevant results should appear in the results section. Check.

2) Conclusions. The conclusions of abstract cannot be different to the manuscript. Check.
Manuscript

Background

3) Lines 64-65: Improve the citation in the text. You should be used the same structure in all text. Here the year appears without parenthesis. In Line 80 and 87 appears with parenthesis. Check all manuscript.

4) Line 85-86: ".......[14]. Decreased odds of live bird was observed only after exposure to methyl paraben [14]". Repeated reference. Keep the second one.

Methods

5) Lines 116-119: Who conducted the interview? How the questions were asked? (open, closed, check list)

6) Line 147: "....characteristics (age, past diseases, alcohol consumption, duration of infertility that may be...". Missing in brackets.


8) Lines 156-177: Review abbreviations and nomenclature. Line 174: "..were used: 224 and 209,..." Why underlined? Check all.

9) Line 192: What protocol? How many people participated in the sample collection? They were formed? Explain.

10) Line 218: ""...R statistical software (ver.3)"". Add program version data (Example: version 3.6.1). Check all document.

Results

11) Table 1. Recommendation: Delete third column and include the information in the text or in the first column.

12) Lines 224-225: Attention to this, non smokers (92.17%). In the data collection was the variable of being ex-smoker contemplated? Only current smoking? Possible biased data. Explain.

13) Lines 230-232: Repeated (Table 2). Only necessary the second one.

14) Lines 235-239: Repeated (Table 3). Unnecessary in line 239.

15) Line 244: (Table 4) Mistake?. The data discussed corresponds to Table 3.
16) Line 245: "mean concentration of the sum of parabens was 19.99 nmol/ml.". Where does the data come from? Not appear in any table. Clarify.

17) Table 4. The table is not clear. The presentation of the table should be reviewed and changed by reorganizing the data. Change format.

18) Table 5. Recommendation format. I think the information is clearer and more visual.

(Coeff.) Use standard abbreviation. Is it correct? Review in Table 6 too. Check all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parabens</th>
<th>Coef (S1-S2)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iBuP</td>
<td>No detected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) Line 258: Delete (Table 6). Repeated in line 260.

20) Table 6. Coef?? Is the standard abbreviation?? Clarify and check.

21) Table 7. Check the same.

22) I still think that the data should be better selected. Assess if all tables are necessary.

Discussion

The discussion should deal with the results obtained and their comparison with other studies. There are paragraphs that do not apply. Review wording.

It should be carefully reviewed and rewritten.

The phrase of the line 332 ("…..this is the first study to assesses…..") is repeated.

Review the correct use of abbreviations in the text.

The conclusions of the manuscript must coincide with those of the abstract. Check.

References

23) Reference should be in the format of the journal. Check 21 and 26.
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