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Reviewer’s report:

1. Line 52 - If you are claiming primacy (first study), a description of the search and search terms used should be included in the Methods. Although you may be correct by declaring this is the first "in a parous population with a fertility rate of 3 and an induced abortion rate of 10%", other studies have reported spontaneous rates by age and parity.

2. Line 162 - In your description on verification of the accuracy/reliability of the data, how did you decide on 114 charts (files) to check and who checked them? It is remarkable that there was not one difference found between the database and the charts.

3. Lines 179-180 - Are these number of women the same as in the first manuscript? If I understand this right, the first manuscript lists 65,536 different women and the revised manuscript lists 65,227 before excluding those with a blank field.

4. Line 226 - The prevalence of chromosome abnormalities in products of conception in spontaneous abortions is not a "belief." It is a fact based on numerous studies.

5. Line 309 - It is stated that the rates of miscarriage among women having fertility treatments were similar to rates for women not having any fertility studies, but no data are given.

6. The original review asked for more details about what type of evaluation these women had for potential causes of their miscarriages. This was not addressed in the cover letter or the revised manuscript but could have an important effect on the results.

7. Lines 326-331- I am unclear about these points. Some readers will not be familiar with the "health basket."

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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