

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_84494
Title of the Manuscript:	Comprehensive review of Ovarian reserve assessment techniques
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>-It is better to mention whole words not abbreviations in the abstract.</p> <p>- Correlation to Response, It is not a clear side title; it needs to be determined more.</p> <p>-The table 1 heading (AMH), did not express the contents of the table and need to be more illustrative. Also, no comment on this table is mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>-The references which are present in table 1, it is better to mention the year of each study.</p> <p>-In the part of (STATIC TESTS OF OVARIAN RESERVE), it is better to arrange tests by their categories, like (hormones), then, imaging-based AFC and ovarian volume.</p> <p>-It is better to add a paragraph about the factors affecting ovarian reserve and its markers as race, life style (smoking, alcohol use), use of oral contraceptive and obesity.</p> <p>-Please, revise all references e.g ref 6 (not a single author as you mention) - J. Kwee, R. Schats, J. McDonnell, C.B. Lambalk, J. Schoemaker, Intracycle variability of ovarian reserve tests: results of a prospective randomized study, Human Reproduction, Volume 19, Issue 3, March 2004, Pages 590–595.</p> <p>Ref 7 also: Joana Peñarrubia, Francisco Fábregues, Dolors Manau, Montserrat Creus, Gemma Casals, Roser Casamitjana, Franciso Carmona, Juan A. Vanrell, Juan Balasch, Basal and stimulation day 5 anti-Müllerian hormone serum concentrations as predictors of ovarian response and pregnancy in assisted reproductive technology cycles stimulated with gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist–gonadotropin treatment, Human Reproduction, Volume 20, Issue 4, April 2005, Pages 915–922,</p>	<p>Noted and revised</p> <p>Correction effected</p> <p>Revised</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>-The review is well written and the ideas are clear but it is too long.</p> <p>-Introduction is long and can be summarized more.</p> <p>-Enumeration of references (as names) inside the document is more than needed which may cause interruption of the reading.</p>	<p>Done</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	