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Reviewer's report:

The main point of my initial review was that the focus on "the payer perspective" in terms of the emergence of genomic medicine was diluted by over-emphasis on other issues, with too much discussion of the biological and medical perspectives and too many biologically/medically oriented examples. In fact, I feel any payer would stop reading this manuscript within 2 pages. I do not feel this major concern has been addressed and in fact the shortcoming may have been exacerbated by the attempt of the authors to address the comments of the other reviewers. In other words, I feel that the other reviewers have in a sense exacerbated the problem of lack of focus by introducing what I feel are issues and details not relevant to the payer perspective. What has been improved is a section that more directly addresses payer perspectives, but it is mainly descriptive and in my view is not an "integrated" insightful treatment of the subject. However, I seem to be in the minority here (compared with the other reviewers) in appreciating this paper. But, this does highlight what I believe to be a fundamental misrepresentation of the whole field of "personalized medicine" - which is a focus on the 'technology' as opposed to the 'person'. I was hoping that a focus on the payer perspective might start moving the needle as it were towards more real world focusing in practical personal and social issues rather than technological and biological/medical issues, the latter of which are adequately handled in hundreds of other papers. I feel that these authors are more concerned about being comprehensive on the subject (for fear of leaving something out) rather than more 'surgical' in dissecting the issues (forgive the analogy). I will leave these comments with the editors to consider given that my other reviewer colleagues seem to have a different perspective. The editors may share these comments with the authors.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests