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**Reviewer's report:**

Discretionary revisions

Why did the authors use 2008 and 2011? Why would they expect or not expect a change to have occurred in the interim? They didn't mention much about why they chose this timeframe in the manuscript.

Would it have been that much more difficult to cover the remaining 50% of pediatric fellowship programs? It's a bit odd to survey half of the programs that only cover 60% of fellows and say something about them.

The paper would be more clear if they took the results and had a section devoted to results of each of the data sources and then one looking at overall results. It's cumbersome to keep reading two numbers in each sentence and have to figure out which number refers to what data source.

Lastly, I understand from the paper that there has been an increase in the interest in GH related offerings at some programs. However, they don't discuss why some programs started increasing these offerings and why most programs don't offer. They don't discuss what kinds of programs should be offered or how programs might consider going about offering this. This paper nicely describes what exists but so what? Why does it matter? What can/should be done with this information?

Thanks for the opportunity to review this paper. I wish the authors the best of luck in their work.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

No