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Reviewer's report:

The revised manuscript is improved, and the story of the child is well described, but the key postulate that there was "an early detection of cancer" in the father still remains unsubstantiated.

1. The diagnosis of the tumor labelled "multilocular tubulocystic carcinoma" is questionable. Tubulocystic carcinoma is not "multilocular". Neither a good description of the morphology, nor an IHC profile of this tumor is provided in the text. A pathology description of the tumor in the report is non-existent and no figure legends are provided?!. In the view of this reviewer the morphology does not reflect the typical morphology of either FH-deficient or HLRCC-associated RCC.

2. This tumor was rather small - max 2cm; this may have been an incidental detection of a benign tumor, prompted by the surveillance. Based on the photos provided this may represent either a "cystic nephroma" or a genuine "tubulocystic carcinoma" - both indolent renal tumors - and typically NOT found in HLRCC patients.

3. No FH or 2SC IHC screening of the tumor was performed (and although this was declared in the response to the reviewer - this statement is not included in the text?!).

4. In the absence of compelling evidence to label the described tumor "kidney cancer" related to HLRCC Sy - the statement in the conclusion that "this is the first report of identification of a parent with kidney cancer by screening performed for this indication" is incorrect and simply stretches the truth.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

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