



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJGO_48225</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LETROZOLE VS CLOMIPHENE CITRATE AS FIRST LINE FOR ANOVULATORY INFERTILITY– AN INSTITUTIONAL EXPERIENCE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>To authors, The theme is interesting. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract: "100% of the cases in letrozole group achieved ovulation in the first cycle of treatment out of which 6 (24%) became pregnant." This study was the comparison between clomiphene (C) vs. Letrozole (L), and, thus, you had better write the data also from L. Otherwise, readers cannot understand the data itself.</li> <li>2. Introduction; The first paragraph should be deleted because this Journal is OBGYN-specific and all readers understand such a textbook like knowledge. The same is true to other descriptions here and there. This manuscript is too long only to explain this simple data. The shorter, the better. If you write long, readers cannot understand the "important" data. Shorten the manuscript.</li> <li>3. Why did you set this number (n=50)?</li> <li>4. Figure 1: Delete! You need not a figure to express this simple thing.</li> <li>5. You touched PCO. How many patients were considered having PCO? How did you diagnose this condition (absence or presence)? Describe this definitely. One cannot understand whether this study was on PCO or not.</li> <li>6. In this study, you did not perform statistical analysis and thus if L showed better outcome than C was not confirmed. State this. And also please state why you DID NOT perform statistical analysis.</li> </ol>	<p>All the corrections and the statistical analysis have been done according to the reviewer comments. The unnecessary part have been deleted as per reviewer comments</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	