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Reviewer's report:

The authors have extensively replied to my comments in their covering letter but NONE of it has been incorporated in the revised manuscript. I therefore have no grounds to revise my opinion about the manuscript.

More specifically:

1. We disagree regarding my first comment. But the authors could have commented in the manuscript on the power of their study.

2. The authors are correct in that sequencing of the uncut fragments to confirm the mutations renders their mutation screen reliable. Please mention this in the manuscript. The presence of positive and negative controls should also be mentioned in the manuscript. The confirmation of the original identification of the D15G mutation in an independently amplified template should again also be mentioned in the manuscript. Readers can not simply assume that the appropriate controls have been done.

3. The authors apparently agree with my third comment. Again, please mention in the manuscript that with a minor allele frequency of 0.25-0.30, there were 3 or 4 homozygote mutation carriers expected in stead of the observed zero. And also then discuss why they consider this a spurious event. And again... if the authors have additional data to support this opion, they should include this in the text of the manuscript.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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