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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We have studied the valuable comments from you carefully and have done our best to revise the manuscript. The responses to the comments are provided below.

1. your paper still needs a substantial language editing and re-writing. For example lines 68-70 "Moreover, There were just a few detailed studies have investigated HRT in Chinese girls with TS, and no study about the girls with TS who were undergoing HRT, to our knowledge". Why capital "T"? Are there a few studies or no study? this sentence contains contradictory information. Many more parts of your paper need editing, so once again this one is just an example.Additionally, the description of patient population (lines 86-92) should be in the result section not methods. My advice is to send your paper to one of the medical writing agencies who is experienced in preparing papers for publication and provide editing done by native English speaking medical writers.
Responses: Thank you very much for your kind reminder. To make the paper clearer and more accurate, we’ve tried our best to revise the paper again and again. For example, we deleted the confusing expression (lines 71-75, 125, 133, 152), wrong spelling and incorrect words (line 132), and tried to make the sentence shorter. At the same time, we sent our paper to the editing agency for a second time and read it carefully when the paper was prepared and send back. The certification provided from the editing agency would be uploaded to the editorial system. We really hope it would meet the request.

2. The description of patient population (lines 86-92) should be in the result section not methods.

Responses: Thank you for your careful recommendation. We have revised it by adding the description of the patient population, age and karyotype in result section (lines 174-182, 186-188), and deleted that part in method section.

These are our responses to the comments. Again, we are very grateful to the editors for your attention to our manuscript. We would greatly appreciate your favorable consideration of it. We look forward to your kind reply.

Yours Sincerely,

Song Guo, Minlian Du.