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Reviewer’s report:

The article deals with an interesting and useful point of clinical practice, which is the expected interval of normalization of b-hCG levels after administration of MTX in ectopic tubal pregnancies. The article is well-written, the statistical analysis has strength points, however, there are certain issues to be revised.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors do not clearly define the inclusion and exclusion criteria of their study. Given the fact that the study is retrospective, it is of great importance to define exactly the characteristics of cases needed to be included and not just mention that these have been published in another study.

2. This remark is strongly associated with the previous as well. The authors do not report in detail the follow-up of pregnancies treated with MTX. When did they perform b-hCG measures? When did they perform ultrasound? How many examinations were performed for each patient? Did it depend on the case or it was a standard protocol followed for all women?

3. Authors need to mention the limitations of their study in the last paragraph of Discussion section. This is a retrospective study which on its own is a major limitation, especially as the study deals with multiple b-HCG values.

4. A flowchart of patients included according to eligibility criteria should be incorporated.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. The comment related with gefitinib in the Introduction study is rather irrelevant and I would suggest to be excluded.

2. The authors should explain what are the minimal symptoms reported in Methods section.

3. In the results section, the authors report “a tubal ectopic pregnancies”. This should be revised.

General comments

1. The question posed by authors is well defined.

2. The methods need to be improved regarding the specific report of inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3. The data is interesting and have clinical value.
4. The figures are accurate and no signs of manipulation are observed.
5. The manuscript rather adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.
6. The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data.
7. The limitations of the study are not stated and this is a point which should definitely be revised.
8. The authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished.
9. The abstract should report in a greater extension the main results of the study.
10. The writing is acceptable, however, revision should be made in certain points.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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