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Reviewer's report:

I found this article very interesting and a valuable contribution to endometriosis research.

1. It was disappointing not to see the flow cytometry results or the immunofluorescence results. These data would add value to the paper as they demonstrate your capacity to perform the work and allows the reader to see what the data. When these results are simply dismissed as a reference it leads to the question of was the work actually performed. You have gone to the trouble of writing the methods for these data and then don't present them. I strongly urge the inclusion of at least one figure that shows some of this data.

2. The presentation of the RT-PCR data is not suitable. The result statement was "significantly higher gene expression levels of Bcl-2 (Figure 1a) and Bcl-xL (Figure 1b) in EESCs compared to EuESCs or CESCs (p<0.01)." The statement indicates that the gene of interest will be presented with three data points and a one-way ANOVA statistical analysis has been performed. However, the statistics performed has not been described, the bar graphs describe E v Eu etc and the error bars are so large that there cannot possibly be any significance. I strongly suggest adding the statistical analysis done to the methods section and ensure the data presented is the mean of each sample analysed (EESC, UEESC, CESCs) +/- standard error of mean. If the data has been normalised to a control sample or eutopic endo or other, make sure this information is also contained in the methods section as data analysis and presentation.

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

Yes

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.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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