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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it investigates the role of Anti-Müllerian Hormone (AMH) in predicting ovarian response and IVF outcomes. Given the increasing prevalence of infertility and the importance of personalized treatment approaches, the findings could influence clinical practices and decision-making in assisted reproduction. The study contributes to the ongoing discourse regarding the predictive value of AMH, offering insights that could enhance patient counseling and treatment strategies. |  |
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