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Dear mrs. Wella Valenzuela,

First of all we would like to thank you, as well as the reviewers for their comments on our manuscript “Cryo-thawed embryo transfer: natural versus artificial cycle. A non-inferiority trial. (ANTARCTICA trial)” (MS: 1659382457625028) And we would like to thank you for accepting our manuscript.

I hope you’ll find our response sufficient.

Kind regards on behalf of all authors,

Eva Groenewoude
As referee 1 was unavailable to re-review, we also asked one of our editorial board members to look at your manuscript and your response to this other reviewer's comments. The board members comments are below:

"The first reviewer requested more explanation concerning non-inferiority design, which is in this study well grounded. The authors have performed a systematic review not yet published though. Actually this design should be more common in clinical science. Perhaps the authors could add these explanations more clearly to the revised paper- there were no marked revisions in the paper concerning this. Before accepting to publication, I would recommend authors to add the response to this non-inferiority question to the discussion."

We have adjusted the alinea regarding the study design (lines 101-108) based on the suggestion that was made by the board member.

Referee 2:
no comments were made