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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript describes results of an on-line survey that assessed health practitioners' knowledge and attitudes about population-based genetic testing for ovarian cancer. The rationale for the study was well-described and the results were clearly presented. The work is timely because of the recently published results from the UK Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening which suggest that screening resulted in a shift to earlier stage cancer at diagnosis in a population of high-risk women.

There are limitations in the authors' work including the small number of respondents within the different practice categories and the lack of random sampling of the target practitioners in the study design, however, these limitations were appropriately addressed by the authors.

Overall, I have only a couple of minor comments for the authors. First, the discussion should emphasize that the survey responses reflect what the practitioners expect they would do in specific situations, however the responses do not reflect actual practices. Second, the authors should discuss the generalizability of their findings, since it was done in the UK. Would they expect that these results would be applicable to other countries where the health systems vary considerably from the UK? Along these lines, it would be useful to add the geographic location of the study to the abstract.

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.
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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?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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