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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper exploring an aspect of Turner Syndrome that remain unclear. The authors have recorded adrenarche and DHEAS levels spanning growth years in a large cohort.

Unfortunately, the authors have chosen to emphasise the DHEAS measurements which are the weakest aspect of this paper. The reference data is from a 20 year paper with no attempt to test if assay variation could account for the differences. Indeed, such a possibility is not even mentioned in limitations. To this reviewer it is simply invalid to use historic measurements in statistical analysis in this way.

The clinical data is interesting and of course it is possible to compare PH staging with reference population. I had sought this comparison in Results and then found it presented in Discussion! TS girls were not different. A senior author might usefully spend some time rewriting the paper with a little more rigour omitting the DHEAS data.
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