



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_17266
Title of the Manuscript:	Chronic Low-Dose Step-up Protocol in treating women with Unexplained Infertility: (37,5 Units versus 75 Units of follitropin alpha as the Initial Dose)
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1- Why retrospective & not prospective study especially if you have enough number of cases & time required for follow up is not too long.</p> <p>2- Table 2 ongoing pregnancy, you should calculate percentage per all cases or all cycles not per conception.</p>	<p>Using the 37,5Units as the initial dose was a period when IVF was not available in our hospital after when some of the high responding cycles are not being cancelled but converted to an IVF cycle.</p> <p>The ongoing pregnancy rates were recalculated per all cycles including ones with all pregnancy outcomes.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1- In table 1 primer & sekonder should replaced by primary & secondary.</p> <p>2- Table 1 you did not comment on antimüllerian hormone. If these data available should mentione</p>	<p>The corrections were made in the manuscript.</p> <p>AMH data were not available.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		