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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Not sure - key details are missing from the manuscript

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Previous concerns have not been completely addressed, the results are still not properly presented.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

- Main concern -
The analysis of genotype distribution in the PA patients stratified or by invasion, or by recurrence do not sound good to me. It's important to compare the difference according to these characteristics among PA (PA without recurrence versus PA with recurrence and PA with invasion versus PA without invasion).

Also, table 3 and 5 show the comparison of each stratified PA group with controls. Invasion and recurrence should be analyzed between PA patients only and these are the results of interest. It's not clear to me if the significant results are relatively to analysis considering only PA patients.

The comparison with control group is correct and necessary only to investigate the association of SNP with development of pituitary adenoma.

Supplementary tables are so confused. What are the authors comparing? What do they want to show? Maybe it is unnecessary.

Minor-

The re-genotyping is not necessarily a quality control proceeding, it's help to avoid mistakes.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Described above.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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