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Reviewer's report:

The study shows results of a questionnaire that was performed on women 135 women choosing NIPT in their pregnancy after a primary positive other screening test for Down syndrome (combined first trimester screening or second trimester screening).

The questions concern women’s understanding on NIPT and their preferences for the type of screening that they would choose in their next pregnancy (primary NIPT screening versus contingent screening).

The data seems sound, but the workup is not very concise and especially the study design (pre-test counselling at the institution) needs to be explained in detail. Sometimes the text is difficult to understand and this seems to be a language problem. This manuscript certainly is of interest and unique in this form but needs extensive revision before it can be published.

Major compulsory revisions:

The methods section needs extensive additional information to understand the study design:

1. Did all included women have Down-syndrome screening at your institution or were they referred to you due to a positive screening test? Explain how you got access to the women taking NIPT since obviously NIPT was not performed at your institution.

2. What type of counseling did all of these women have at your institution? Were all women counseled by a fetal medicine specialist at your institution? If yes why was this counseling excluded from the “source of information” section? Line 94 states “An information sheet was provided” What is written on this information sheet?

Is the questionnaire also a control of the quality of counseling that you provide? If yes, this needs to be discussed.

3. It is important to state which kind of NIPT was offered to the women. Were these different types of NIPT or was only one type of test offered? Questions 7/8/9 can only be answered correctly if the kind of NIPT is known. (SNP technology versus whole genome sequencing)

Results:
1. How many women did fill out the questionnaire before they knew the results of their NIPT?

2. Line 134: if you have the exact numbers you should write 90.4% of women knew false positive results and 95.6% knew about false negative results instead of putting both results together. Alternatively you could state more than 90% .... But 90.4-95.6 is not the correct way to present the results. Please change this way of result presentation also in line 135 and line 139 and line 162.

3. line 149 was this statistically significant?

4. line 150 and line 151: cannot find 9.8 and 20.1 on the table.

5. line 152 was this statistically significant?

6. line 153 cannot find number 10 and 14.5 in table 3. What do these numbers mean?

7. line 154/155 I cannot understand this sentence.

8. line 158 what characteristics? how is source of information shown in table 3?

9. line 163-165 cannot understand this sentence.

Tables:
Table 1: How is advanced maternal age defined?

- Table 3

Line 469 Describe what is compared to what. NIPT before 15 weeks versus NIPT after 15 weeks? also for advances education.

Discussion:
“Knowledgeable” and “costing” are two words that are not used correctly. I cannot comment very much on the discussion since I am not completely sure about the study design and this is essential to know in order to be able to fully interpret the discussion and give advice on missing information.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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