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Reviewer's report:

REVIEWER'S COMMENT BMC-WH

1. There are some grammatical errors on the manuscript. The author should do the corrections as indicated on the tract changes.

2. I don't know if the author used only GnRH agonist for the stimulation or FSH/HMG because am aware that the agonist is used for the purposes of downregulation and not stimulation as alluded by the author.

3. The author should indicate in the methodology how the severity of nausea and vomiting was measured

4. Did the author consider the renal function tests of the participants to this study since renal dysfunction is associated with OHSS and the Cetrotide is also excreted via the renals.

5. The author evaluated the efficacy but not safety of Cetrotide as stated in his aims.

6. The discussion flow is deficient as the author did more of the literature review of other authors without putting his own study in perspective

7. The author should look at his aim again as it did not mention anything about the E2 and OMD but mentioned only the safety and efficacy of cetrotide

8. The author should include a flow chart on randomization
Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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