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Reviewer's report:


1. Since there were girls with an age of 10.5 years or even less (which I do not describe as 'close to 13'), I still suggest a change of terminology.

2. P5. This is still very confusing. In ref. (17) is stated that the investigators "... invited all girls and boys to a follow-up study at the target age of 10.8 years in girls and 11.8 years in boys. The target ages were selected so that puberty stage data at an age presumed to represent the start of puberty development in the children could also be collected." This is a little better, but it is hard to understand how girls invited to participate at 10.8 years, can enter the study at 10.5?

3. P7. This is now OK.

4. p8. OK, too.

5. P12. Still not explained. I find no calculation or suggestion of a trend. In the original manuscript, p.6, it says that "Before analyses, preeclampsia was further categorised into mild/moderate (combined) and severe." With such a dichotomisation, it is not possible to speak of a trend.

6. P20. This is an awkward sentence, and does not explain anything. See above, P5.

7. P23. I can understand this explanation and it is possible to keep the table. However, the changes in the table text does not add anything to what is already said in the table. It can safely be removed.

8. OK

9. OK