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Reviewer's report:

This software tool is the "leading tool capable of creating pedigree charts for applications in genetic counseling". This tool should be helpful to clinics as well as genetics research in general. This type of genetic tools is needed.

The major weakness of this manuscript is the authors failed to show in a more rigorous way the exact differences/advantages between this software and other pedigree drawing tools. What are the main advantages? The only comparison appears in the DISCUSSION section, instead of RESULT section which is more standard. For the comparisons, the authors imply existing pedigree drawing software tools 1) require specialized knowledge of clinical genetics 2) are not fully compliant with international recommendations 3) do not automatically draw pedigrees based on questionnaires 4) are not for multiple families. Is it true that all three existing software tools are so bad? I think this kind of comparison is not rigorous and quite likely the statements are false. Please be more detailed on the comparison. A peer reviewed manuscript should be more than a user manual.

Minor comments:

1. Several references have a non standard format. It's likely those software tools have their associated manuscripts for the purpose of citation.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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