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Reviewer's report:

It is a good manuscript and it should be published - see my answers to the 9 questions below

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   > Yes!

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   > Yes, but I have a question MRI was performed in 5 girls because of absence of a family history of advanced puberty, it is not clear to me if there is a family history of advanced puberty in the rest? Please confirm or explain!

3. Are the data sound?
   > Looks OK

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   > Yes!

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   > Yes!

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   > Yes!

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   > As far as I can see, but a question to the patient cohort. The authors have earlier published articles on advanced puberty. I will like to know if some of the patients reported in earlier articles are included in the patient cohort in the manuscript?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   > Yes!

9. Is the writing acceptable?
> Yes!

Minor spelling mistake on page 5, line 5 from bottom of page AH calculated (DS) pleased correct DS to SD