The authors have followed the development of breast development according to Tanner breast stages (B…) and uterine volume (sonography) of 71 girls with Turner syndrome replaced with sex steroids and compared these with presumably healthy controls. The authors concluded that "HRT leads to normal breast development in girls with TS, half of whom reached Tanner stage B5 in our study, although the uterus eventually developed a suboptimal status."

Comment

The development of response targets to HRT in girls with TS needs further evaluation. This is why the study is principally valuable.

Unfortunately the manuscript as it is lacks sufficient scientific quality. The introduction focusses only on uterine development and potential fertility while half of the project deal with breast development. The reviewer immediately started out to search for reference [1] in the text. It remained also unclear which kind of estrogen was used <2007 and which one thereafter (giving a reference is not sufficient). The article has a number of other problems with its presentation, not least the unclear language.

Therefor the reviewer concluded regrettably that the article with its interesting topic cannot be recommended for publication. The authors should seek advice from someone who is experienced in scientific writing and in the English language.
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.

Yes

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

Yes

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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