BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis
ESPS manuscript NO: 19659
Title: Towards better meta-analyses in assisted reproductive technology: Fixed, random or multivariate models?
Reviewer's code: 00742209
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2015-05-20 09:42
Date reviewed: 2015-06-29 23:56

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author uses a mathematical approach to demonstrate existing concerns with meta-analyses conducted with studies on ART. In general, the author applies the findings from the analyses to support existing recommendations for "best practices" when performing a meta-analysis. The concern about selecting the appropriate model used for the meta-analysis based on heterogeneity of the studies included in the analysis is not new. Strategies proposed to address this concern and those regarding the stability of the findings in a meta-analysis include performing a sensitivity analysis, use a FM and RM in the meta-analysis, and provide a "level of confidence" for the finding based on the risk for bias from the meta-analysis. As the author noted, multi-variate meta-analysis makes presumptions about the selected studies and need additional information (see appendix). The findings from the analyses conducted in the manuscript are most relevant to ART. Would this article attract more readers in a journal on reproductive medicine than in this one? Please review use of language for clarity. For example, "comparing the FM with two alternative models" in the abstract and "general specific profile" in the materials (para one). Consider stating that the FM was compared

with the RM, and the univariate model (RM) was compared with the multi-variate model (MM) in the abstract because comparisons were limited to these variables (see para 4 in the discussion). Specific How was the number of simulations determined for this analysis?