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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Daniele Campa,

Thank you for considering our paper „BRCA1/2 mutation screening in high-risk breast/ovarian cancer families and sporadic cancer patient surveilling for hidden high-risk families“ (MS: 1598566121760391) for publication in your journal and both reviewers for their critical and valuable remarks and comments.

According to reviewers’ requests we have made following changes in the manuscript:

Dr. F. Canzian has suggested shortening manuscript and we have reduced its size and removed some details as requested. Results are presented in more compact way.

Dr. M. Thomassen wrote:

i) „If, in certain populations, a panel of few founder mutations account for majority of observed mutations, it may be a good strategy to limit the screening to. However, some information is missing in the manuscript to conclude on this.” In Introduction (paragraph 2) we have already referred to Latvian population as an example of such situation with two dominating mutations in the BRCA1 gene.

ii) „The description of the consecutive patients is not satisfactory. Have the patients been tested for the two indicated well-known founder mutations or other mutations?” It was already stated in Materials and Methods part that patients were screened for BRCA1 founder mutations and were found negative. We have rewritten this part to make this clearer.

iii) We removed the data on 301 healthy controls as was suggested.
iv) Data on Latvian (and global) birth rates was included in Introduction as we want to emphasize importance of molecular diagnostics in case of small families.

We hope that these changes will meet the requirements of the reviewers. If necessary, we will be happy to make further changes. Thank you once again and Happy New Year!

Sincerely yours,
Edvins Miklasevics