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Reviewer's report:

General
Association studies have a track record of inconsistency so it is important that initial positive reports are fully tested through attempts at independent replication. Furthermore, this report investigates the possible occurrence of other disease causing mutations in this gene. Although it might be criticised for screening using SSCP which does not detect all mutations this is not a serious deficiency given the number of cases screened. Had there been a significant occurrence of other disease causing mutations the expectation would be that approximately 80% of them would have been detected by the methodology used.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
1. Last sentence of Abstract could be split into two sentences, for greater clarity, by adding comma after "association", full stop after "cases" and starting new sentence with "Thus".
2. Would the authors be able to offer a possible explanation for the initial positive association reported by Gambardella et al and differences between the two control populations that the authors used in the current manuscript?
3. Would the authors be able to condense the Abstract, in keeping with the small but appropriate size of the manuscript?
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