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	-It is better to mention whole words not abbreviations in the abstract. - **Correlation to Response,** It is not a clear side title; it needs to be determined more. -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. -The references which are present in table 1, it is better to mention the year of each study. -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. -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. -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. 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,	
Optional/General comments	-The review is well written and the ideas are clear but it is too long. -Introduction is long and can be summarized more. -Enumeration of references (as names) inside the document is more than needed which may cause interruption of the reading.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Samar Mahmoud Sharaf**
Department, University & Country	**Zagazig University, Egypt**