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Reviewer's report:
I appreciate that the authors were somewhat responsive to the recommendations of this reviewer, and I support the goal of demonstrating that advances in precision medicine should be implemented equitably to avoid exacerbating disparities in health outcomes. However, I think there is still work to be done on creating a cohesive and compelling story of this analysis. I think that the objectives of the study need to be revisited, and the manuscript reorganized to align with the objectives. The objectives stated on page 13 of the PDF are not aligned with the description in the abstract. The abstract makes it sound like this is just an exploration of predictors of guideline-level testing in the population, which is reasonable. Yet, to truly know whether testing is adherent to guidelines we would need to define a population eligible for testing, and that was not possible given the limitations of the dataset. In addition, the conclusion must be very clearly written and compelling, as I recommended in my first review. As it stands, the manuscript ends with a statement of the limitations of the study and one sentence on possible next steps. Why did the authors do the study? What did they truly want to learn? What did they learn and what do they want readers to understand? The answers to these questions -- if present -- are buried beneath disorganized writing and confusing methods and results. The manuscript needs deep revision with an eye toward making the information as simple, clear, and compelling as possible.

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.
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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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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