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General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. This case report is of interest to two groups (1) those who are concerned with the practice of female circumcision in phenotypically normal females and (2) those who are concerned with genital feminization in individuals affected by disorders of sex differentiation. The authors suggest that female circumcision is problematic not only due to the harm that it entails on girls and women, but also because it makes it difficult to pick up cases of i46,XY intersexuality where presumably the external genitalia are ambiguous at birth. My major problem with this is that we do not know if the reported case exhibited ambiguous genitalia, and depending on the etiology of their condition (for example complete AIS, Swyer syndrome) they may very well have had normal appearing female external genitalia at birth. The authors seem to suggest that if the genitalia in such cases were not altered by practices of female circumcision, then an accurate diagnosis might by possible. However, it is generally accepted that the external genital phenotype is not adequate to make such diagnoses as over-masculinied female pseudohermaphrodites can appear no different from under-masculinized male pseudohermaphrodites. Therefore, the claim that female circumcision precluded proper diagnosis of such cases is unjustified.

2. My second point of disagreement is that these authors suggest that a missed diagnosis lead to incorrect sex of rearing. However, it is stated that this case sees herself as female. In summary, this is an interesting case that I believe should be reported. I disagree with the authors on why the case should be reported.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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