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Reviewer's report:
My major concern regarding the paper is related to the sample size and the p-value threshold employed. Namely, in WES studies, the acceptable p-value should be much lower than 0.05 (at least 0.000001, even lower for rare variations (European Journal of Human Genetics (2016) 24, 1202-1205), while the sample size of the study, if small, runs a risk of single marker association testing being underpowered, especially in detecting rare variants (BMC Genetics (2017) 18:14). If the study is underpowered and acceptable p value threshold is set too high, the conclusions might not be valid.

The cases are women, but controls are both men and women: is there any data on sex-related effect of examined variations?
Additional discussion in regard to observed difference in distribution of variants between cases and controls, related to biological/pharmacological plausibility, is needed.
I would suggest skipping Wikipedia as a database (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Wikipedia_is_not_a_reliable_source), and stick to valid and reliable ones.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
No
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.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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