

Manuscript: Clinical pregnancy is not associated with sperm quality in POSEIDON groups 1 and 2 patients.

— Editorial Comments

Recommendation

Marta Olszewska  15.11.2022

Major Revision Requested

Message for Author

Dear Dr. Handayani,

The manuscript entitled: 'EFFECT OF SPERM QUALITY ON IVF OUTCOMES IN UNEXPECTED POOR RESPONDERS: FOCUS ON POSEIDON GROUPS 1 AND 2' passed through the review process and we invite you to perform 'Major Revision' based on the reviews made by two independent reviewers. Please, read the reports carefully and implement all necessary requirements before submission of the reviewed version.

— Reviewer Reports

2 submitted

Report

Reviewer 2 13.11.2022

Dear Editor, The topic of this retrospective manuscript is not interesting for the scientific field, but the study population is large. I am suggesting the following revisions.
1) The revision of IVF terminology on the title with ICSI would be more appropriate. 2-)The heterogenous ovarian stimulation protocols (GnRH agonist and antagonists, the different Gn doses and preparations) and the heterogenous sperm preparation techniques (gradient and swim-up) give bias to the study.3-)There is not any limitation paragraph (retrospective study, heterogenous stimulation, etc). 4-)The version number of SPSS programme and the manufacturer name should be written. 5-)What was the sperm morphology evaluation method (Kruger criteria or other) ? 6-) what was the multiple group (bigger than 3) comparison test for continuous numerical data (table-2)?

Report

Reviewer 1 14.10.2022

Effect of sperm quality on ivf outcomes in unexpected poor responders: focus on Poseidon groups 1 and 2

I would like to congratulate you for this very interesting manuscript. But, I have a few comments and/or suggestions:

Title: The title does not realibly reflect the objectives and results of the study; should be more specific related to: IVF laboratory outcomes or to add information about clinical outcomes (clinical pregnancy rate, implantation rate, live birth rates, etc)

Abstract:

Should be rewritten according to changes in data.

Method

Ovum pick-up and nuclear maturation assessment

Several authors have showed an improving in laboratory and clinical outcomes using IMSI compared to ICSI procedures; in the present study it would be important to rule out the possible confounding effect of these techniques on their results.

Sperm preparation

Seminal samples that were evaluated are from 2015 until 2021 then isn't correct: ... seminal samples were evaluated according WHO 2021... correct it.

Insemination and assessment of fertilization, embryo grading and transfer

Information about culture procedure is too generalized and should be expanded in more details: type of culture media used? Extended culture with/ o not refresh media at day3?, conditions of culture co2 or tri-gas system? Culture media drop under mineral oil? Etc..

About results; the authors measured just biochemical pregnancy (beta hCG), and in conclusion they says.. "clinical pregnancy was comparable among groups" Which is not correct, a clinical pregnancy is when gestational sac, embryo and heartbeat are evident.

Conclusion

Response to reviewers

Major revision

— Response to Revision Request

Your Reply

Nining Handayani 28.11.2022

Reviewer 1 1. I would like to congratulate you for this very interesting manuscript. But, I have a few comments and/or suggestions Author Reply: Dear reviewer 1, we thank you for providing us with insightful comments and suggestions. Here are our response to your comments and or suggestions. 2. Title: The title does not realibly reflect the objectives and results of the study; should be more specific related to: IVF laboratory outcomes or to add information about clinical outcomes (clinical pregnancy rate, implantation rate, live birth rates, etc) Author Reply: The title has been revised accordingly (Title page) 3. Abstract: Should be rewritten according to changes in data Author Reply: The Abstract has been rewritten based on data changes accordingly (Page 2, line 46-50) 4. Method: Ovum pick-up and nuclear maturation assessment. Several authors have showed an improving in laboratory and clinical outcomes using IMSI compared to ICSI procedures; in the present study it would be important to rule out the possible confounding effect of these techniques on their results. Author Reply: During multiple analyses, it was found that the sperm selection method was not a potential confounder. We have added the results of multiple analyses in the Results section. We also provided you with the multiple analysis step. Supplemtnary file for review by reviewers (attached to revised version) 5. Sperm preparation: Seminal samples that were evaluated are from 2015 until 2021 then isn't correct: ... seminal samples were evaluated according WHO 2021.. correct it. Author reply: Done Page 4, line 120 6. Insemination and assessment of fertilization, embryo grading and transfer: Information about culture procedure is too generalized and should be expanded in more details: type of culture media used? Extended culture with/ o not refresh media at day3?, conditions of culture co2 or tri-gas system? Culture media drop under mineral oil? Etc.. Author reply: Information regarding embryo culture conditions has been completed, Page 5 line 143, 145, Page 6 line 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, Page 7 line 173, 174, 175 7. Results: the authors measured just biochemical pregnancy (beta hCG), and in conclusion they says.. "clinical pregnancy was comparable among groups" Which is not correct, a clinical pregnancy is when gestational sac, embryo and heartbeat are evident Author reply: We thank you very much for pointing out that we missed elucidating how we measured clinical pregnancy. We have completed it accordingly (Page 7, line 179-181) 8. Discussion: The discussion must be reviewed and rewrite with a better scientific support Author reply: We have reviewed and made several adjustments in the discussion part. We hope it would meet the reviewer's expectation (Page 9, Line 224-233, line 10 261-264) 9. Conclusion: Statement: "clinical pregnancy was comparable among groups" Which is not correct, a clinical pregnancy is when gestational sac, embryo and heartbeat are evident Author reply: The issue has been resolved (Page 7, line 179-181) Reviewer 2: 1. Dear Editor, The topic of this retrospective manuscript is not interesting for the scientific field, but the study population is large. I am suggesting the following revisions. Author reply: dear reviewer, we respect your opinion about our manuscript. 2. The revision of IVF terminology on the title with ICSI would be more appropriate Author reply: Thank you for your suggestion. This suggestion has been incorporated into the revised version (Running Title, page 2 line 38, 46, page 8 line 214) 3. The heterogenous ovarian stimulation protocols (GnRH agonist and antagonists, the different Gn doses and preparations) and the heterogenous sperm preparation techniques (gradient and swim-up) give bias to the study Author reply: Thank you for pointing out this issue. We have performed multiple analyses to address this problem. In the final model, it was found that different stimulation protocols as well as

Minor revision

— Editorial Comments

Recommendation

Marta Olszewska [AE](#) 05.02.2023

Minor Revision Requested

Message for Author

Dear Dr. Handayani et al.,

your manuscript entitled: 'Clinical pregnancy is not associated with sperm quality in POSEIDON groups 1 and 2 patients' came across the next round of revision by two independent reviewers. However, there are still missing points that should be clarified as suggested by both reviewers. Please, read them carefully and answer point by point for all of them.

— Response to Revision Request

Your Reply

Nining Handayani 19.01.2023

Dear reviewer 3 and 1 We thank the referees for providing us with valuable comments and suggestions. Here are our replies point-to-points to the referee's comments (File attached).

File

Feedback to reviewer and editor_second reply.doc 51 kB 