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Dear Editor


We have responded to the requests of your referees.

**Referee 1**

Major Comments:

Point 1 We have detailed the explanation of ‘uninformative genetic test results’ as requested. We have mentioned UV’s as part of $BRCA$ genetic testing in the discussion. Our small sample of tested women in this study did not have any variants.

Minor Comments.

Point 2 We removed the table of names as recommended.

Point 3 We removed the section stating that the study was limited as all the women were middle class and white as suggested by the reviewer.

Point 4 With regard to the minor suggestions put forward by this referee, we have taken note and reduced the paper.

Point 5 We have removed the statement in the conclusion that related to genetic testing in the UK as this does not refer to our results as mentioned by the reviewer.

Point 6 Typographic Errors. We have attended to the grammatical errors as mentioned.

**Referee 2**

Point 1 Major Compulsory Revision.

We have taken note of the more up to date papers in this field and thank the referee for the significant list. We have included all the named papers as well as some other papers published beyond 2007. We have rewritten parts of the paper to accommodate these more recent studies both from the perspective of the patients and the professionals.
Point 2  Discretionary Revisions. Although we agree with the reviewer that discussion drawing on the insights of the combination of perspectives both of the patients and the professionals would add interest to this paper, we have limited our discussion as we are in the process of writing another paper in more depth on the professionals perspective. We feel that this paper is long enough and we would not do it justice by a limited discussion.

We have altered the referencing to match the journal.

We thank the reviewers for their hard work and help with this paper.

With kind regards,

Audrey Ardern-Jones