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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

This manuscript addresses important questions about the Nigerians’ knowledge and attitudes towards personal genomic testing. However, it seems that several concerns detracted from the manuscript as a whole. I have listed those concerns as follows:

1. Overall, it seems that the authors have covered too many topics in this manuscript (especially in the Results section), prohibiting an in-depth discussion of any one area.

2. Introduction section: It seems that the introduction is too “thin”, and therefore, does not provide sufficient information to the readers to understand the background of the study. For example, the authors might want to provide more information about the H3Africa Project (it seems to be a very interesting project) and genomic testing issues in Nigeria (Nigeria does not represent the whole of Africa). Another example is that the authors mention that education, poverty, culture, religion, and health behavioral practices differ between Africa and the rest of the world. The authors might want to provide some data and also explain education, poverty, culture, religion, and health behavioral practices in “Nigeria.”

3. Some of the research questions and terms (e.g., affect) used in this manuscript are more appropriate for quantitative than qualitative data (e.g., "Culture and religion were found to affect perspectives of respondents on genomics test... [Abstract]; and “Most respondents in the FGDs claimed that their perception of genomic testing was affected by religion or culture... [page 14]"). This could be interpreted as showing a statistically significant difference.

4. Why were some data collected by focus group discussion and some by key informant interviews?

5. It is unclear how the authors assessed participants' knowledge about the use of genomic tests. In general, it is better to assess “knowledge” by giving participants a number of multiple choices or true/false test questions.

6. Discussion section: It is unclear why the authors compared their research findings with the findings of Chen et al. (2007). The purpose of Chen’s article is to conduct a systematic review to assess the factors affecting individuals’ decision to accept or decline cystic fibrosis carrier testing/screening. Given the research questions, samples, methods, and variables between the two studies...
are different, I would suggest the authors to find other references which are more relevant to their study.

Minor Essential Revisions
1. There are a number of places with formatting/spacing/typo errors and some of the sentences are too long (e.g., the third paragraph in the Background section has only one sentence – which is a long [five lines] sentence). To improve the clarity of this manuscript, I would strongly encourage the authors to carefully go through the whole manuscript for editing.

2. There are a number of places where there are formatting errors and typos in the citations and references. For example, the citation style of references 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16 are different from the other references. Also, there are some errors in the reference list. For example, the issue of reference 5 is incorrect, and, the issue and page numbers of reference 6 are incorrect.

3. On page 18, it seems that the authors quote one sentence (“parents viewed the benefits of pediatric testing....”) from reference 12, but they have not stated the page number there.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**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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