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Reviewer's report:

Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
Yes, the question is clear and focussed.

Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
The spontaneous pregnancy chance is not taken into account.

Are the data sound and well controlled?
I am missing a systematic search and a description on the validity of the data.

Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Differences in prognosis between couples are not taken into account.

Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes

Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

Is the writing acceptable?
Yes

General
This is a well written and clear manuscript on the costs and effects of IUI and IVF. The assumptions are clearly done.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors must refer to a checklist on economic analysis, for example a list as produced by Drummond et al.

Spontaneous pregnancies that occur without treatment should be the reference strategy, and the other strategies must be compared to this baseline strategy (Fertil Steril. 2000 Apr;73(4):748-54.)
The authors must do a systematic search in their sources of evidence.

There is no systematic description of the strategies under study.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes