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Dear Professor Edmunds,

Thank you for your e-mail and for the reviewer’s comments. We answered the questions point by point. We hope you will find the revised version suitable for publication in the BMC Medical Genetics.

**Referee 1.**

1. **Major concern.**

   We are surprised that the present main concern of the referee was not noticed at first review what is very unusual to ask for it second time as a main concern. Table 4 is showing well what combinations are in one chromosome, as one raw mean combinations of the four SNPs on one chromosome, on very simple way. The referee apologize that she is not familiar with this, but how can she make major concern if she is not an expert? It is clearly shown what combination is in one chromosome. It is similarly shown in other articles (Liu et al J Pediatr 2010, PMID: 20070976; or Tan et al Mol Hum Reprod 2008;14,317-324).

   Somehow it was clear for Referee 2, who understood it.

2. **Minor revisions.**

   1. We incorporated in the Materials methods the text related to the sample size calculations, as Referee 2 suggested it also.
   2. We made a sentence related to the fetal analysis in the discussion.
   3. There are several meanings of multiple testing, the referee means the four SNPs, it is clearly stated that all were studied on same samples. We made an extra clarification in the Methods section. “We determined the four SNPs in all samples.”
   4. We re-checked the abbreviations again and made them clear in the text and tables also.
   5. We corrected the name of the SNP, we apologize for that.
2. Referee 2.

Thank you for your comments. We inserted the first paragraph of your recommendation in the revised version of our ms in the Methods section. We think the second paragraph is well suited in the Discussion.

Thank you for consideration for publishing our manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Bálint Nagy Ph.D.