Dear Reviewer,

First of all, thank you for your interest and valuable comments, according to your comments we tried to provide required information and correct the mistakes and include them in the appropriate parts of the manuscript.

* Fields to be corrected are marked in the text

According to your comments, we corrected the text.

* It is also advisable to make the following changes.
* In figure1, the markings on the picture should be more obvious

According to your comments, we changed the markings of figure 1.

* In Legends of figure 1, what the st2 mark implies must be written

In legends of figure 1 ‘’st2’’ rewritten as ‘‘st’’ (seminifer tubules)

* In Legends of figure 2, is there any difference between “m” and “k”. What the double-sided arrows imply must be written.

There is no difference between “m” and “k” in legends of figure 2 and we changed ‘’m’’.

Double-sided arrows imply muscular layer.

* Author will have to omit the Statistical Analysis from results, I cannot say anything to your subjective assessments of epithelial heights and tubule diameters between figures of control and experimental group but if author state statically analyses by calculating data, author have to make a stereological study. With calculating 6 sections it wasn’t accurate, author will have to calculate all of the specimen. Author cannot state there is a difference between groups (control- experiment), but author can state there is a difference between to figures that heobtains from figures

Dear Rewiever,

You are absolutely right. We didn’t explain our statistical method clearly. Measurements of thickness of seminiferous tubules epithelium and diameter of seminiferous tubules were performed in 10 randomly selected areas in 36 sections (n=36) in six cross-sections (Histologic slides) from each experimental group and these results were compared. These data were added at the statistics methods. *(According to the literature; Cell J. 2011 Spring;13(1):1-4. Epub 2011 Apr 21. Morphometric evaluation of seminiferous tubules in aged mice testes after melatonin administration. Mehraein F, Negahdar F.)*