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**Reviewer's report:**

Title : "Establishment" or "Development" instead of Establishing

Page 5 line 48: remove "this corresponding"

Page 6 line 60: "member" instead of "number"

Page 7 line 23, 27, Table 2: same error as above

Page 9 line 5: Not clear about the sixth point, similar with Fifth point?

Table 3: Font need to be standardized

Figure 1: It is better to color the Karyotype near the bottom to make it consistent; highlight informative SNP is also another detail to address.

General comments: This paper showed a successful POC of PGH to select structurally normal embryos for IVF. It can be very useful for the general public. However, there is a lack of details in the methods section to show the whole process. Figure 1 is not very helpful to pieces the information together. In paper, author claimed 2-day is enough to get all the results. Does that include the collection of carrier, parent, family info also? Will the related cost and time make this system not as appealing as author described here? At the same time, it is not very clear why the Illumina platform is chosen and what are the other options out there for comparison, which might be more cost effective if the sole purpose is to differentiate balanced vs structural normal embryos. The two major references on PGH is 6-10 years old, should reference some newer updates in this field. Also, to include more details about how to call informative SNP and how these SNPs can be used for other purposes can be meaningful for other researchers.
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