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**Reviewer's report:**

- A better definition of the control group is necessary regarding the ovulation trigger.

- Why AA did not use antagGnRH as ovulation induction and agGnRH for ovulation trigger, when necessary, as this scheme avoids OHSS?

- In AA Hospital, from how many patients these 48 OHSS cases derived? It was IVF or ICSI? For all, what was the CP rate, the IR and the LBDR? And the luteal support? It would be better if AA describe the stimulation, gamete and embryo handling procedures. Why AA did not use the other patients as controls additionally?

- Is it correct to have moderate and severe OHSS patients without treatment besides avoiding embryo transfer (control group)?

- Table 5: where is day 8?

- the 3 cases with hospitalization for antiemetic and crystalloid replacement fluid therapy had not paracentesis?

- of the hospitalized cases there were no other complications?: thrombosis, pleural effusion?
- what AA mean with "both therapeutic policies" in cases treated with antagGnRH as trigger?

- do AA with "favorable outcome" mean "no dangerous complications"?

- why AA did not discuss the antagGnRH protocol and the agGnRH as trigger?

- please verify if there are not any articles on the subject from 2017.

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.

No

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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