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The authors make conclusions about the older brother having worse cognitive function then the younger, based on a one time cognitive screening test score (MoCA) difference of 3 points. Without any other information (ie education, functional status), particularly without any neuropsychological testing, I don't think this claim can be made based on a one time test performance.

The authors include a pedigree, however from the manuscript it is not clear whether all of the children of these two brothers have been genotyped or have phenotype data available. Please clarify this in the manuscript and in the figure. If this is lacking I am not sure how much the pedigree is contributing to the manuscript since theoretically all the children of both brothers would be heterozygotes for this mutation as well. May consider removing this.

I think overall the manuscript content could be delivered much more succinctly. I don't think Table 1 adds too much to the paper and can be deleted.

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.

Unable to assess

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

No

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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