

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 82237

**Title:** Two case reports of three live births from in vitro fertilization-embryo transfer following the administration of gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist without Gonadotropins

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06479460

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MBChB

**Professional title:** Academic Fellow, Academic Research, Doctor, Researcher

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Malaysia

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-30 09:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-09 04:12

**Review time:** 9 Days and 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Fair 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Fair 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Fair 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? It will more meaningful if the author would summarize the cases with their hormonal profiles in one table. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? N/A 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? N/A 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Most of the references all more than 20 years old and I suggest to get an references that are more recent. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? I feel the language use by author need improving. Suggest for a proofread and editing to improve the language. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that

more studies are needed is not acceptable? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 82237

**Title:** Two case reports of three live births from in vitro fertilization-embryo transfer following the administration of gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist without Gonadotropins

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05238069

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-16 04:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-09 08:20

**Review time:** 24 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection

<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described two cases experienced ovarian hyperstimulation following the administration of GnRHa alone for pituitary down-regulation and FET. Both of pregnancy outcomes were good. This paper only illustrates two cases, but it has little significance for clinical guidance. Hence, it is recommended to provide more clinical advice on the management of such patients is recommended. However, some errors need to be corrected listed as the following. Query 1: As is known, ovarian hyperstimulation following the usage of GnRHa without Gn is extremely rare. The authors suspected GnRHa stimulated new waves of follicular development one after another and the circulating Gn level might increase and generate self-feedback. Please provide relate Literatures to support the points. Query 2: The title “Two live births from IVF-ET following the administration of gonadotrophin-releasing hormone agonist alone” had better be revised as “Three live births from IVF-ET following the administration of gonadotrophin-releasing hormone agonist alone ”. Query 3: In the line of “Mai Li1, Ping Su2, and Liming Zhou1”, it had better delete “and”. Query 4: In the line of Kerywords—“ Gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist” “G” is recommended to be altered “g”. Query 5: The conclusion of the second sentence might not be obtained from the discussion section above. It is suggested to add the discussion. Query 6: In addition, the authors should offer the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 82237

**Title:** Two case reports of three live births from in vitro fertilization-embryo transfer following the administration of gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist without Gonadotropins

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02446201

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Full Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-06 03:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-19 17:39

**Review time:** 13 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty

<b>Creativity or innovation of this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation
<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Instead of two live births, live birth could be used as in all there are 3 live births. Also instead of writing using GnRH agonist alone better to write without gonadotrophin, as hcg has been used along with GnRHa. Case report should be added to title as per CARE guidelines 2013. 2 Abstract. : The abstract should be restructured starting with introduction of treatment protocol and its uniqueness followed by patient's clinical findings, interventions and outcomes. 3 Key Words. It is suggested to add infertility, FET and hcg. 4 Background. The introduction is adequate. It is suggested to include literature about female infertility issues and treatment protocols used earlier, so as to maintain the flow of manuscript. 5. Method and Result: Relevant medical history and their outcomes have been mentioned. Important diagnostic results and follow ups are included in the manuscript.. However there are some suggestions for improvement 1. The protocol used could be presented as a timeline to make the make



methodology clear. 2. The hormonal assay done before and after treatment could be presented in tabular form. 3. In case 1, the levels of F.S.H and L.H are not mentioned after treatment. Whether twins were carried full term (weeks) is not mention. 4. In case 2, if initially USG done, then findings should be included. Also the time of embryo transfer is not clear. 5. Duration of treatment with GnRH. Whether single shot or multiple doses are used is not mentioned. 6. Discussion. The discussion needs to be re structured to maintain continuity of paper. The strengths and limitations of the reported cases need to be discussed with proper references. Add relevant references of reports showing live births following GnRHa treatment. 7. Illustrations and tables. No comments 8. Biostatistics. Not Applicable 9. Units. S.I units for hormones have been used. 10. References. Few more latest references should be included. 11. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. This is an interesting study, the paper is generally well written. However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings in regards to the flow and readability of the text. While the study appears to be sound, the authors should include more information that clarifies and justifies their choice of methods, making it easier to follow. In discussion section more relevant and recent literature needs to be cited. The authors should revise the language to improve readability