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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is greatly improved. In my opinion, a few changes are still needed, as follows:

Major Compulsory Revision

Add references 40-44 to the list of references. In the version available to me, the text refers to references 1-44, while the list of references ends with reference 39.

Minor Essential Revisions

The language of the manuscript is improved. I have a couple of suggestions:
(a) Proper use of prepositions. Examples: Abstract, Conclusions, page 3: "...suffering from BD..." Methods, page 5: "...were relevant to our project..."
(b) Feedback, Return of Results and Incidental Findings, page 14, last paragraph. Correct the sentence "This becomes particularly true due when including the costs of associated genetic councelling."

Discretionary Revisions

The manuscript presents a thorough overview of a complicated and evolving ethical issue. What I would like to see in some critical areas is the position of the authors. I will use the example which impressed me most: The three options for protecting participants in genetic research presented in page 12 have huge philosophical, and practical, differences and provide greatly varying, potentially, degrees of "protection". I would like to know the authors preference and their reasons for it.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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