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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript concerning tolerability of ductal lavage in screening and follow-up of among high breast cancer risk patients is interesting, because methods to integrate biological-level markers in the breast cancer diagnostics are under development; This is expected to bring better options in comparison with the imaging methods of tumors. The main finding indicating that the lavage will not be useful due to its intolerability (leading to refusal in subsequent service) deserves attention and it seems that development of proper sampling methods is not straightforward yet at the moment.

The paper is analysed thoroughyl and well-written, so I have only few minor comments:

1. The authors should briefly provide more detailed information about the validity of the markers available from the ductal lavage. Now it is mentioned that the method might improve early breast cancer detection (for example page 3, 3rd line) but details about the real validity of the biomarkers were not given. Before making conclusions from this study, it might be helpful to discuss briefly also about the diagnostic gain in comparison with the more tolerable methods (such as imaging, or nipple aspiration).

2. Also, weighing the potential variation in sampling error could be briefly discussed, e.g. in pages 14-15 while discussing about the various potential sampling options.

3. Limitations, page 13: I felt that it was not really a limitation that the study used selected high-risk subjects, as one could think that importance of the discomfort would be even larger among healthy women than among the selected group under the study. The authors could reformulate this section a little and perhaps explain better that the limitation did not really cause a bias.

4. In the discussion there was missing a section or paragraph comparing systematically the current study with the earlier studies. Is it possible that not only the statistical methods differed (c.f. references 1, 6, 7, 8 as mentioned briefly in page 3-4) but also some other aspects e.g. instruments or anesthesia differed? It is a little embarrassing that some earlier studies had quite contradictive results to the current study.
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