Elevated pre-injection basal LH concentrations are common in girls treated for central precocious puberty
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What is already known on this topic?
Gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonists (GnRHa) reduce gonadotropic activity and are efficient in suppressing pubertal progression in precocious puberty. Pituitary suppression during GnRHa therapy is optimally assessed by GnRH stimulation.

What this study adds?
Pre-injection basal LH remains at pubertal concentrations during GnRHa therapy in spite of lack of pubertal progression, a significant decline in BA and height SDS. Even after shortened intervals with subcutaneous administration of leuproreline 3.75 mg in girls suspected to have progressive pubertal development during treatment of central precocious puberty (CPP), did pre-injection basal LH not drop to prepubertal concentrations.

Abstract
Objective: Consensus on how to monitor girls with central precocious puberty (CPP) during gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonist (GnRHa) treatment is lacking. Increased unstimulated basal luteinizing hormone (LH) concentrations have been suggested to indicate lack of suppression. We aimed to evaluate pre-injection basal LH concentrations during GnRHa (leuprorelin 3.75 mg) treatment 4 weekly in girls with CPP.

Methods: Medical records were reviewed for girls with CPP treated at a single center from 2014-2019. Clinical characteristics and laboratory findings during treatment were systematically recorded.

Results: A total of 587 GnRHa pre-injection basal LH concentrations were analyzed in 74 girls. Basal LH was pubertal (≥0.3 IU/L) in 53.5% of blood samples and 87.8% of all girls had a pubertal basal LH concentration at least once. A GnRH test (n=29) was repeated in 23 girls due to suspicion of clinical progression, elevated basal LH or recordable estradiol concentrations. None had a stimulated LH > 3.1 IU/L. The predictability of treatment suppression (specificity) of basal LH concentrations was 12.0% when compared to repeated GnRH stimulation tests. Despite shortening the GnRHa injection interval to 3 weeks, basal LH concentrations remained pubertal in 85.7% girls. A significant reduction in height SDS (p<0.001) and bone age advance (p<0.001) was observed during treatment.

Conclusion: Pre-injection basal LH remains at pubertal concentrations during treatment with leuprorelin 3.75 mg in girls with CPP. Clinical monitoring of pubertal progression is preferable to routine basal LH concentrations. Repeat GnRH stimulation testing should be regarded the gold standard.
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Introduction
Central precocious puberty (CPP) in girls is often idiopathic (90%) [1,2]. Gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonists (GnRHa) are used to suppress pubertal development by stimulating gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) receptors continuously causing pituitary desensibilization and reduced gonadotropic activity [3,4,5]. The use of GnRHa has increased in recent years [6,7], however, there is still no consensus on how to monitor the pituitary suppression during GnRHa treatment [8]. It has been suggested that increased basal luteinizing hormone (LH) concentrations indicate lack of suppression [8,9,10]. In case basal LH concentrations provide the same information as a GnRH stimulation test, monitoring would be less time consuming, costly and less invasive for the patients [11]. The aims of this study were to assess if pre-injection basal LH concentrations are reliable as a proxy for clinical progression of puberty during GnRHa treatment, and to test if basal LH concentrations are in accordance with GnRHa stimulated LH concentrations under GnRHa suppressive treatment.

Design and Methods
We set out to review a cohort of girls followed in our clinic, who were treated with leuprorelin acetate 3.75 mg injections every 4 weeks for CPP at the Department of Pediatrics, Aalborg University Hospital, Denmark. The electronic patient system (Clinical Suite 2017, DXC technology, Tysons, Virginia, USA) was searched using the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) codes for CPP (DE226A) and associated diagnosis (early puberty (DE301), hormonal dysregulation in puberty (DE309), premature thelarche (DE308A)). All girls
with the above-mentioned codes, who attended the Department of Pediatrics at Aalborg University Hospital between January 2014 and September 2019, were identified (Figure 1).

Only girls who had a pubertal response (stimulated LH ≥5 IU/L) at time 30 minutes during a GnRH stimulation test (gonadorelin 0.1 mg iv) and who started subcutaneous injections with leuprolin acetate 3.75 mg with 4 weekly intervals were included (Figure 1). Previous medical history was extracted from the medical notes retrospectively from the first contact. Data was collected systematically from the electronic patient records by two investigators (AH, SS) according to a predefined protocol. A third researcher was consulted in unclear cases (TL). At first visit: age at presentation, tanner stage [12], presenting symptoms, family pubertal history, height and weight were noted. Dates and results of the diagnostic GnRH stimulation tests and of repeated GnRH stimulation tests were obtained. Dates, GnRHa pre-injection basal gonadotropin concentrations and estradiol concentrations were noted. Hormonal blood samples and clinical examinations were undertaken regularly with 3-6 months intervals by pediatricians. A pre-injection basal LH ≥0.3 IU/L was considered pubertal. A stimulated LH/FSH ratio >1 was interpreted to indicate breakthrough of hypothalamic suppression. During follow-up: bone age (BA), brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and hormonal blood samples (pre-injection basal gonadotropins, estradiol) were registered. At the final clinical visit: age, height, weight and treatment status were noted. Standard deviation scores (SDS) of height and body mass index (BMI) were calculated based on Danish reference data [13]. Heights and weights were measured in clinic by a specialist endocrine nurse using a stadiometer with a precision of 0.1 cm or 0.1 kg, respectively. BAs were assessed according to Greulich & Pyle using BoneExpert software (Vivisana Aps, Denmark) on X-ray images of the left hand and wrist. LH, follicle stimulating hormone (FSH), and estradiol were analyzed on Roche-Cobas 8000 immunochemistry module (Mannheim, Germany) by an electro-chemiluminescence immunoassay. Limit of detection was 0.1 IU/L for LH and 20 pmol/L for estradiol. Interserial coefficient of variation at the detection limits were <20%. Interserial coefficients of variation were 5.2% at 0.5 IU/L and 2.0% at 6.2 IU/L for LH and 11.0% at 360 pmol/L for estradiol. The laboratory is ISO 15189 accredited.

The study protocol was approved by the hospital management (journal no 2019-005812-58) as required by Danish law.

**Statistical analyses**

Descriptive data were presented as mean± standard deviation (SD) or median (range) according to normal or non-parametric distribution. A paired t-test for parametric data was used to compare two variables in the same individual. An unpaired t-test was used for comparison of two independent groups. A Mann-Whitney U test was applied to compare non-parametric data. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlation between two parametric variables. Predictability of treatment suppression by basal LH concentrations was assessed by comparison of prepubertal basal LH concentrations among girls with fully suppressed GnRH responses (LH <5 IU/L and LH/FSH ratio <1) who had a second stimulation test. A p-value of <0.05 was considered significant.

**Results**

**Population characteristics**

Inclusion criteria were fulfilled by 74 girls (Table 1). The mean presenting age in hospital was 8.0±1.2 years. Mean age at onset of treatment was 8.2±1.3 years. Within the time period the medical course was complete for 55 girls and the average duration of treatment was 2.8±1.2 years until age 11.2±0.7 years. The remaining 19 girls still had ongoing treatment at completion of the study. Two girls (2.7%) had reached menarche at the first visit and they were clinically described to be at Tanner stage B3 and B4. Special circumstances with mental retardation or cerebral palsy influenced the decision to treat in two cases. Concern of psychosocial stressors related to early puberty contributed to the decision of treatment in n=16 girls (21.6%). A family history of early puberty was confirmed by 18 families (24.3%), and another eight girls (10.8%) had an increased risk due to international adoption.

Average height SDS (Table 1) at first visit was above mean for age but proportional to average BMI SDS. At final visit height SDS approached the mean for age whereas age-adjusted BMI SDS had increased (p<0.001) (Table 1). BA was examined in all girls at the first clinical visit and the mean BA was 1.2±1.3 years ahead of the chronological age (CA). Consecutive BAs were undertaken in 52 girls (70.3%) and the BA advance regressed and approached CA over time (0.5±1.0 years) (p<0.001) (Table 1).

Brain MRIs were undertaken in 58 girls (78.4%) at a mean age of 7.7±1.2 years (range 3.0 to 9.7). One girl had a rapid pubertal development with menarche at age 9.7 years at Tanner stage 3 for which reason she started GnRHa therapy. Six girls (10.3%) with a mean age of 6.2±3.3 years (range 3.0 to 9.3) had abnormal findings e.g. hamartomas or sequelae from brain traumas (Table 2). One girl aged 9.3 years had multiple MRI scans (ID 1, Table 2) of which the one presented here, was closest to the time when leuprolin was started (due to psychological reasons). Four girls had incidentalomas (Table 2).

**Pre-injection basal LH concentrations**

During treatment with GnRHa, 587 blood samples (7.9 per girl, range 1 to 20) were analyzed for pre-injection basal LH, FSH and estradiol. Basal LH ≥0.3 IU/L in 314 samples (53.5%) and 65 girls (87.8%) had a basal LH ≥0.3 IU/L at some point in time. There was a declining temporal trend of pre-injection basal LH concentrations during treatment (r=0.09) (Figure 2). Basal LH concentrations were ≥1.1 IU/L (range 1.1 to 2.4) in 10 girls at least once during treatment. Three of these girls had a repeat GnRH stimulation test of which one had a LH/FSH ratio >1 and consequently the GnRHa dosing interval was reduced to 3 weeks.

**Repeat GnRH stimulation tests**

A GnRH stimulation test was repeated (n=29) in 23 girls (31.1%) (six girls had two tests). Four girls (17.4%) had a ratio of LH/FSH >1, but none had a stimulated LH ≥3.1 IU/L. Unstimulated basal LH concentrations drawn prior to GnRH injection were 0.2 IU/L, 0.4 IU/L, 0.7 IU/L and 1.1 IU/L, respectively. The remaining 25 GnRH stimulation tests showed LH/FSH ratios <1 and LH peaks ≤2.9 IU/L. Three tests were preceded by pre-pubertal basal LH concentrations (<0.3 IU/L) and 22 tests had pubertal basal LH concentrations ≥0.3 IU/L (median 0.4 IU/L, range 0.3 to 2.2 IU/L) at least once prior to the test. Thus, the predictability of proper treatment suppression (specificity) according to pre-injection basal LH was 12.0% (Figure 4).

There was no significant difference (p=0.354) in median basal LH concentrations between tests with LH-FSH (17.4%) (0.6 IU/L, range 0.2-1.1) and suppressed tests (0.4 IU/L, range 0.3-2.2).

The mean time from the diagnostic GnRH stimulation test to the first repeated test was 1.7±0.9 years (range 0.4 to 3.8). The likelihood of having a pubertal response on repeat GnRH testing was poorly correlated with the time from diagnosis to repeated testing (r=0.4). Likewise, was the CA not associated with an increased risk (r=0.1). When comparing the groups of girls with and without a repeat GnRH stimulation test, there was no significant difference in BMI SDS at first (p=0.253) and last contact (p=0.248).

During repeat GnRH testing a poorly correlation between basal and stimulated LH concentrations was observed (r=0.4) (Figure 3).
Estradiol

In 33 of 74 girls (44.6%) estradiol was detectable (≥20 pmol/L) at some point in time. The estradiol concentrations were significantly higher at diagnosis (median 100 pmol/L, range 30 to 320) than during treatment (median 40 pmol/L, range 20 to 380) (p<0.001). Estradiol was >100 pmol/L in two samples during treatment. One resulted in a repeat GnRH test (estradiol 320 pmol/L, peak LH/FSH 0.60/0.6 IU/L). The second girl with an increased estradiol (estradiol 380 pmol/L, basal LH 0.2 IU/L) stopped therapy shortly after at age 12.3 years. There was a trend towards a more advanced BA in girls with a detectable estradiol concentration at diagnosis compared to those with no detectable estradiol (p=0.095) (Figure 5). This observation was not present at the end (p=0.944) (Figure 5).

The four girls who had a LH/FSH ratio >1 on repeat GnRH stimulation testing never had detectable estradiol concentrations during treatment. Eight girls with prepubertal GnRH test responses on retesting previously had detectable estradiol concentrations, also when discounting initial, possibly unsuppressed, concentrations sampled within the first three months of GnRHa treatment. The mean time from onset of treatment to the first intensification was 1.3 years (range 0.2 to 4.4).

Basal LH concentrations (n=59) were sampled in 14 girls who had an increment in the GnRHa dosing interval to 3 weeks after which point none had signs breast development. The majority of the samples (n=44, 74.5%) in 12 girls (85.7%) persisted having a pre-injection basal LH ≥0.3 IU/L (median 0.4, range 0.3 to 1.8 IU/L). Two of three girls with a basal LH concentration <0.3 IU/L prior to intensification developed puberal pre-injection basal LH concentrations ≥0.3 IU/L after shortening the dosing interval.

Discussion

In this large cohort of 74 girls with CPP, pre-injection basal LH remained at pubertal concentrations during GnRHa therapy, in spite of lack of clinical pubertal progression (breast development), a significant decline in BA and height SDS. All girls were followed consecutively and 87.5% had pre-injection basal LH concentrations ≥0.3 IU/L at some point in time during GnRHa therapy. Even after medical intensification, basal LH did not drop to prepubertal concentrations but remained as high as 1.8 IU/L. Thus, elevated concentrations of LH did not indicate insufficient pituitary suppression as the girls never showed signs of breast tissue development, BA advancement or had increased growth velocity. Wirumrat et al. found in accordance with our present findings that in spite of pubertal basal LH concentrations during GnRHa treatment, clinical measures such as Tanner stage, BA and decreased growth velocity indicated sufficient pituitary suppression [9]. Other smaller studies in girls treated with a 50 mg histrelin implant have also reported elevated LH concentrations during treatment [14,15].

One study in girls treated with a 50 mg histrelin implant suggested that continuous low concentration LH secretion tapers off over time as basal LH concentrations decreased during the course of therapy [14]. We did not observe this temporal decline in LH concentrations similar to findings in another study using leuprorelin 3.75 mg [16]. If the shorter half-life of leuprorelin 3.75 mg allows breakthrough gonadotropic activity at GnRHa trough concentrations towards the next injection remains speculative. Growth velocity and pubertal progression, however, did not advance, indicating that any breakthrough at hypothalamic/pituitary level was not of clinical significance supporting the efficacy of the leuprorelin dose.

The majority (86.2%) of our repeat GnRH stimulation tests (n=25) were anteied by pubertal LH concentrations (0.3-2.2 IU/L) but on repeat stimulation none had a peak LH >3.1 IU/L. Consequently, basal LH concentrations had a low specificity of only 12.0% incorrectly suggesting that girls were not biochemically suppressed during GnRHa treatment when compared to the repeat GnRH stimulation tests. The same observation has been found in other studies in girls treated with histrelin implants [14,15]. These findings indicate that clinicians need not be concerned about elevated LH concentrations during GnRHa therapy in our series reaching as high as 2.4 IU/L, if there are no other indicators of pubertal progression such as breast development, BA and growth velocity.

Lee et al. found that basal LH concentrations ≤0.60 IU/L and 0.75 IU/L predicted 70.0% and 60.0% respectively, of girls sufficiently suppressed during GnRHa treatment [16]. A higher cut-off for basal LH identifies more girls with breakthrough gonadotropic activity (increased sensitivity), however, on behalf of reducing the specificity (correctly suppressed girls) meaning that caution not to overlook unsuppressed girls should be warranted as the cut-off rises [16].

We, like others [9,14,15], question the advantage of including routine basal LH concentrations as a monitoring strategy for pituitary suppression during GnRHa therapy. Consecutive clinical assessment assisted by growth velocity and BA is likely superior as a first line strategy. In case of doubt about progression of puberty, which may be the case during assessment of breast development in a girl with an increasing BMI, analysis of a basal LH may assist in deferring the suspicion if not elevated. As overtreatment, which has socioeconomic costs [4,6] and increase the burden of unnecessary painful injections [6] should be avoided, our results support the recommendation that GnRH stimulation testing should be considered the gold standard to evaluate suppression during GnRHa treatment [8].

Weight gain during GnRHa treatment has already been highlighted and rise in BMI SDS was also observed in our group [17,18]. A tendency towards a more pronounced advancement of BA at diagnosis was seen in girls who had a recordable estradiol concentration during GnRHa treatment [16]. A higher cut-off for basal LH identifies more girls with breakthrough gonadotropic activity (increased sensitivity), however, on behalf of reducing the specificity (correctly suppressed girls) meaning that caution not to overlook unsuppressed girls should be warranted as the cut-off rises [16].

Studied Limitations

Due to the retrospective design of our study, suspicion of clinical pubertal progression was not necessarily confirmed by a repeat GnRH stimulation test prior to medical intensification. Also, we encountered only four girls with a LH/FSH >1 during GnRH retesting, which did not add to the evaluation of suppression. Thus, a comparison of biochemically unsuppressed children to suppressed children was not possible, which is ultimately needed to answer the question at what concentration unstimulated basal LH may indicate repealed pituitary suppression.
The electro-chemiluminescence immunoassay used to analyze LH concentrations had a detection limit of 0.1 IU/L, and was thus not as sensitive as other assays [15]. However, we aimed to assess the highest concentrations of LH, for which reason this did likely not affect the results.

Estradiol was inappropriately elevated in two cases. Although our estradiol analyses were undertaken in the same laboratory on an electro-chemiluminescence immunoassay, tandem mass-spectrometry, which is more accurate particularly when analyzing small concentrations, was not used.

**Conclusion**

Basal LH concentrations often remain at pubertal concentrations during GnRHa treatment, but does not necessarily reflect insufficient gonadotropic suppression. The current study emphasizes that routine clinical monitoring of girls during GnRHa therapy is preferable to routine pre-injection basal LH concentrations. In cases with dubious clinical progression, a low basal LH may defer the suspicion. A repeat GnRH stimulation test however, is to be considered if doubt persists. Finally, we suggest that estradiol concentrations should not be monitored routinely in girls treated for CPP.
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Figure 1. Flowchart showing patient inclusion and exclusion criteria in GnRHa treated girls with CPP.

Fig. 1.

ICD-10 search: CPP, early puberty, hormonal dysregulation in puberty, premature thelarche
n = 278

Medical records screened for CPP diagnosis
n = 278

Misdiagnosis, excluded
n = 183

Full medical records reviewed for inclusion
n = 95

No treatment, excluded
n = 21

Girls with CPP + leuprolelin acetate 3.75 mg 4 weekly
n = 74

Figure 2. Pre-injection basal LH concentrations during GnRHa treatment for CPP. All samples were drawn just prior to the next GnRHa injection. The horizontal dashed line indicates the cut-off for a pubertal baseline LH concentration.
Fig. 2.
Figure 3. LH concentrations (IU/L) at time 0 and 30 minutes at repeat GnRH stimulation retesting. LH concentrations <0.1 are marked as 0 (dark blue circle). Two tests had equal concentrations (square).
Figure 4. Girls split according to pre-injection basal LH concentrations prior to repeat GnRH testing (+ had repeat GnRH test/ – had no repeat GnRH test). Girls who had a repeat GnRH test (n=23) are only represented once. If more than one repeat test was undertaken (n=6 girls) the first test in time was accounted unless overruled by a pubertal response at the second test (n=1).

*N=62 girls had LH ≥0.3 IU/L minimum once up until the first repeat GnRH test (another three girls developed LH concentrations ≥0.3 IU/L after the first GnRH test and are not accounted in the figure).

**Prepubertal: LH <5 IU/L and LH<FSH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basal LH</th>
<th>0.3 IU/L</th>
<th>Basal LH &lt;0.3 IU/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=62 (83.8%)*</td>
<td>n=12 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ GnRH test</td>
<td>n=19 (30.6%)</td>
<td>+ GnRH test n=4 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH &gt;5 IU/L</td>
<td>n=0 (0%)</td>
<td>LH &gt;5 IU/L n=0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH =FSH</td>
<td>n=3 (15.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepubertal**</td>
<td>n=16 (94.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=8 (48.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=4 (33.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=1 (25.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2 (50.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. BA advancement compared with estradiol (<20 pmol versus ≥20 pmol) at diagnosis and at the end of therapy.
Fig. 5.
### Table 1. Clinical and radiological characteristics at first and final clinical visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First visit</th>
<th>Final visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=74 Mean±SD</td>
<td>n=74 Mean±SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>8.0±1.2</td>
<td>10.7±1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age – treatment (years)</td>
<td>8.2±1.3</td>
<td>11.2±0.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA advancement (years)</td>
<td>1.2±1.1</td>
<td>0.5±1.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (SDS)</td>
<td>0.9±1.6</td>
<td>0.6±1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (SDS)</td>
<td>0.7±1.1</td>
<td>1.2±1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting symptoms (n (%))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast development</td>
<td>68 (91.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth acceleration</td>
<td>34 (46.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menarche</td>
<td>2 (2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrenarche (hair, sweat, acne)</td>
<td>46 (62.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood swings</td>
<td>18 (24.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Age at final injection. Calculated on 55 girls who stopped GnRHa injections within the study period.
** Calculated on 52 girls who had consecutive BA.
BMI, body mass index; SDS, standard deviation score; BA, bone age.
Table 2. Cerebral MRI in girls (n=10) with abnormal findings.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathological</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Age at MRI (years)</th>
<th>MRI</th>
<th>Pre-injection LH (range)</th>
<th>Peak LH*</th>
<th>Medical intensification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Supracellular pilocytic astrocytoma near the pituitary gland.</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Tuber Cinereum hamartoma</td>
<td>0.2 to 0.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Microadenoma. Sequelae after meningitis</td>
<td>&lt;0.1 to 0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Tuber Cinereum hamartoma. Microadenoma</td>
<td>&lt;0.1 to 1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Sequelae after subdural hematoma</td>
<td>0.1 to 1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Radiotherapy cause of esthesioneuroblastoma</td>
<td>&lt;0.1 to 0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Enlarged pituitary stalk</td>
<td>0.5 to 1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Microadenoma</td>
<td>&lt;0.1 to 0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Microadenoma</td>
<td>0.2 to 0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Microadenoma</td>
<td>0.1 to 1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Girls who had a repeat GnRH stimulation test during therapy.