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Reviewer's report:

It is very important your data because you have two new mutations in a cohort in the same country. The way it is presented there is nothing new from what was published before regarding phenotype. What I suggest to you in order to make it better is to use metacore analysis from Thomson Reuters in order to find out the cascade that is damaged that can explain the phenotype you have in your patients. It is also important to add the classification suggested by ACMG (Richards S et al, Genetics in Medicine, 2015) regarding the two novel mutations. Also you need to make consistent the way you write genes and proteins. In animal genes has first capital letter and italic, human all capital letter and italic. Protein is always capital letter without italic. I also suggest to create a figure with exons and intron and also the protein and add to there the know mutations published till now.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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