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Reviewer's report:
I reviewed with interest the manuscript entitled: "Management of obstetrics outcomes of 17 heterotopic cornual pregnancies". Below is my review of the paper as submitted.

General comments:
This retrospective analysis looked at the management and outcomes of women diagnosed with heterotopic cornual pregnancies from July 2010 to December 2015. The study has merit, not least a large number of cases of a rare condition, and addresses an area of clinical and research relevance. Nevertheless, there are some fairly fundamental issues with the paper. While I can appreciate the difficulties of writing a paper in a foreign language, there is a need for significant language revision.
I prefer the term 'interstitial pregnancy' rather than 'cornual pregnancy' to describe a pregnancy that has implanted in the interstitial portion of the Fallopian tube, as it is more anatomically accurate and specific.
The term 'miscarriage' should be used instead of 'abortion'. Abortion should be reserved for termination of pregnancy.

Specific comments:

Title
It should be 'obstetric outcomes', not 'obstetrics outcomes'.
Abstract
P2 line 10 - I would restructure the sentence as follows "The aim of this study was to investigate the outcomes of women diagnosed with heterotopic interstitial pregnancies". The study is neither designed nor powered to assess or clarify the optimal treatment strategy.
P2 line 44 - I would restructure the sentence as follows "In the follow-up study, 13 of the 14 women who had an ongoing intrauterine pregnancies delivered healthy live babies vaginally or by Cesarean section. The other woman was diagnosed with a miscarriage"
P2 line 22 - The sentence starting "Maternal general….." needs complete restructuring.

Introduction
P4 line 15 - I do not see the value of referencing serum hcg here
P4 line 46-54 - see earlier comment

Material and methods
There needs to be some description of how the cases were retrieved. Is there a denominator for the total number of pregnancies seen during this time?

Data collection
P5 line 47 - I am uncertain why data was acquired as to whether the current pregnancy had been conceived naturally or by ART, when the title of the study implies it was only looking at pregnancies conceived after embryo transfer.
P6 line 46 - I would use 'miscarriage' instead of 'abortion'
There needs to be a much more detailed description of the face-to-face interviews. Why were they performed? How was intelligence assessed? How was language assessed? At what age were the interviews conducted? Who performed the infant assessments? Could all this information have been gleaned over the telephone? Is gender an important outcome?

Statistical analysis
P7 line 19 - I was unable to see any p values in the paper.
Results
There is a lot of duplication between the results section and the tables. I would use more tables rather than more prose but they need to be more succinct and easier to interpret.

Discussion
The strengths of the study must be discussed
P11 line 59 - the word 'extremely' is not needed.

Table 1
This table needs a different format. A table spread over 5 pages is impractical.
Replace 'orifice of the uterus' with 'cervix'

Table 2
This table adds little. I would either remove it or have a comparison of laparoscopy and laparotomy with each being a separate column and the data being grouped together as a range and a median.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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