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Reviewer's report:

In the manuscript entitled "Design of the Growth hormone deficiency and Efficacy of Treatment (GET) score and non-interventional proof of concept study" the authors investigated the efficacy of a scoring system designed for to summarize the features of GHD and to evaluate its ability to measure the treatment efficacy. Although the authors claimed it is a proof of concept study the numbers of the patients and especially the untreated controls are not enough to establish a new scoring system. The study is not well designed and I have several major concerns as follows:

1. As health related QoL score the authors used SF-36. A well established and validated QoL scoring system for adults with GHD (QoL-AGHDA) is in use in most of the European countries. What's the reason for not using this scoring system?

2. The first major problem in the design of the study was lack of the data in healthy controls. The GET score should be performed also in healthy controls.

3. Second major problem in the design of the study was the low numbers of patients in treatment subgroups (Table 2). The analysis could not be reliable with 3-4 patients in control groups.

4. The clinical characteristics of the patients with GHD were not well documented. What are the other deficient hormones and were they replaced adequately? What were the diagnostic criteria of GHD and which dynamic tests were used for the diagnosis? etc…

5. In the discussion section first paragraph the authors mentioned that GET score was designed based on the evidence in the literature. But the given literatures were rather old. The authors have to use updated literature.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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