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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is improved. I'd like to thank the authors for their careful consideration and responses for the issues raised. There are a few final recommendations for changes:

Background Second Paragraph: "The evidence regarding medications with known pharmacogenomics implications is rapidly increasing, ranging from basic research and expert opinion (weaker) to meta analyses of randomized clinical trials (stronger)."

Suggest changing to: "The evidence regarding medications with known pharmacogenomics implications is rapidly increasing, ranging from expert opinion supported by the science to an extent (weaker) to meta analyses of randomized clinical trials (stronger)."

Under second paragraph discussion section - "As expected, subjects sought evidence, such as expert consensus and randomized clinical trials, supporting........"

Suggest changing to - "As expected, subjects sought expert consensus or direct evidence, such as randomized clinical trials, to support the clinical impact of genetic testing........

Note regarding above changes - Consensus opinion cannot be assumed to equate with evidence.

Comment: Table 4 is a good addition+

The following is a suggestion that may add value to the manuscript but will leave this to the authors discretion. A short discussion of the potential for a more structured rapid approach to searching may be useful for the reader. For example, in the systematic review arena, the derivation of search terms for questions revolve around the PICO elements - P (Population), I (Intervention/indicator), C (comparator/control, O (outcome). The approach may complement the berry picking strategy. There may be other structured approaches that the author wishes to propose that in the future, may be amenable to investigation.
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