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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? - I do not believe that this is a "new" question, however, it was a very interesting article and the question was well defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? Yes, I believe the methods were appropriate.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled? It seemed so, however I do not feel adequately qualified to make this assessment.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes, very much so. It would however be helpful if a table was included with the ages of diagnosis for each associated cancer (Discretionary).

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes.

7. Is the writing acceptable? Yes, although there are a few minor essential grammatical revisions:

   A) The last sentence in the first paragraph of "background" doesn't seem to make sense, please consider revising.

   B) 2nd paragraph of the same section, 5th sentence, should read CRC and EC, not CRC an EC, please correct.

   C) In the "results" section under study population, 3rd paragraph, the second sentence is difficult to follow, please consider revising.

   D) Under lifetime risks, it would be helpful if you could define "all" LS-associated tumours, ie does this statement included CRC and EC.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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