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The Authors describe arguments for the considered and culturally sensitive introduction of publically funded NIPT in Aoteara New Zealand to detect Downs syndrome.

The paper is interesting and topical as it describes some of the contrast between a medical view of screening, largely based from a Western philosophical mind-set versus the culturally distinct views of Maori and Pacific women.

The issues that this paper raises extend beyond the particulars of Maori culture and emphasise the disconnect often witnessed between the health care professionals who organise screening programmes and the public who are the recipients of screening. Understanding and expectations differ between these groups and this is often heightened significantly within particular cultural groups. The introduction of genetic testing into this mix adds to the potential for confusion.

As screening programmes spread around the world into culturally and economically diverse groups models exploring and proposing culturally informed decision making with user input are particularly valuable.

I think that this paper should be published and the authors encouraged to consider how the model that they propose may inform the introduction of screening, both antenatal and newborn, into populations and groups with differing world views and cultural heritage.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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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?
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