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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 1

Comments 1 In the results section under 'natural cycles over the age of 35' - the body of the text actually reports on those who have had induction ovulation (promoting excretion cycles) rather than natural cycles. Was this a typing error or were the wrong results analysed?

Reply: Sorry, it’s a typing error. It should be patients with natural cycle

Comments 2 Again in the discussion section it states 'when the age is no more than 35, BMI has no effect on E2, LH and P levels' - according to the results this should be the group who are over 35 years

Would like to see more discussion around the women who are over 35 found to have no correlation with BMI and hormone levels. I feel the discussion in this age group is lacking

Reply: The error is revised. Discussion about women over 35 is added.

Reviewer 2
Comments 1 This journal needs language review preferably by an English speaking person. There are inappropriate terms used, for example: "stone cutting position' = lithotomy position, "promoting excretion cycle" = ovulation induction.

Reply: Language errors are revised.

Comments 2 Background:

Comments on results and methods should be moved to relevant sections and background section reviewed. The aims of the study are unclear.

Reply: Comments are moved to discussion. The aims of the study are revised.

Methods:

Comments 3 Inclusion criteria- what was the upper limit of BMI 35.1kg/m²? where as in results section the 3rd BMI category is indicated to be more than 25.

Reply: the upper limit of 35.1kg/m² is added in the criteria of obese group.

Comments 4 General information: need to indicate the groups that patients were divided into but the actual number of patients in each group should then be indicated in results section as a description of the sample population

Reply: Thanks. It’s been moved to the results section

Comments 5 The methods used for ovulation induction are unclear. Was the same method/medication/regime used for all these patients? Why were patients with PCOS excluded but patients with ovulatory disorders included? what kind of ovulatory disorders were these?

Reply: The methods used for ovulation induction are the same for all these patients. Ovulatory disorders are disorders other than PCOS.

Comments 6 Was vaginal ultrasound monitoring done for all groups of patients? ie natural vs ovulation induction cycles? and how frequently were ultrasounds done? How exactly was the peak LH value determined? was this a blood or a urine test?

Reply: Vaginal ultrasound monitoring was performed daily for all groups.
As specified in Methods section, when the dominant follicle diameter was more than 16 mm, the LH peak value was detected using the LH semi-quantitative ovulation test paper every day to predict the ovulation.

Results:

Comments 7 Text in section 3.3, 1st sentence is incorrect

Reply: It’s been revised.

Comments 8 sections 3.1 to 3.4 are very repetitive and would benefit from addition tables or figures to better present the data

Reply: The data are already in Table 1 to Table 4. Section 3.1 to 3.4 are intended to describe the results in detail.

Discussion:

Comments 9 The discussion section needs review: the 1st paragraph is simply a repetition of results without any discussion or comparison to existing literature.

Reply: Discussion is revised.

Comments 10 There are numerous grammatical errors, with areas of literature review which would be better placed in the background section and then expanded on in the discussion.

Reply: Grammatical errors are revised and the literature review is moved to background section.

Comments 11 There is a contradiction of results toward the end of the discussion

Reply: This part of discussion is revised.

Comments 12 I suggest reviewing the abstract and title of journal once rest of text has been revised.

Reply: The abstract and title are revised.