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Reviewer's report:

The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found.
The objective of the study is well defined by authors.
In the Background: “However, both laparoscopy and hysteroscopy have long waiting lists, are invasive, painful and carry surgical and anesthesiologic risks [5].” I do not agree because waiting lists depend on the hospital and in some cases are short. Moreover office hysteroscopy is a minimally invasive procedure, well tolerated by patients and without the need of anesthesiology.
The methods are appropriate and well described. I would suggest the following minor revisions:
1) Before performing the exam usually patients need to guarantee to have had protected intercourse or no intercourse at all since last menstrual period. Did you check it? If yes I suggest you to specify it.
2) Specify better how do you check tubal patency by ultrasound?
Data are clearly described and the manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition
The discussion is well balanced and adequately supported by the data.
Regarding the conclusion I would suggest to put the sentence “it is well-tolerated and the associated vagal effects are few and often mild” as the first sentence of the conclusion paragraph because it is the main result of the study.
The writing is acceptable

Figure 2 shows an indirect sign of tubal patency. I suggest to put a figure which represents clearly a direct sign of tubal patency such as the passage of liquid/air through the fallopian tubes.
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