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Reviewer's report:

The authors address a very important topic in this manuscript about reinterpretation of genetic variants. Overall it was a well-written manuscript and I have no major comments.

Minor comments:
page 6, line 76 - The authors state that all molecular genetics laboratories were included, but then state that no commercial labs were included. Are there any commercial labs in the Netherlands? Please clarify statement.
page 7, line 100 - I don't know what NVIVO 11 is (well I did google it) - if software, need version and manufacturer.
page 18, lines 297-300 - 1 sentence paragraph, consider revising
page 20, line 346 - the "S" in syndrome should not be capitalized.

Not addressed and might be considered as part of the discussion or limitations, is that if the patient/ordering physician is recontacted, what is the liability (legal?) to find the patient if either has moved or relocated. In other words to what extremes must a laboratory go? Note this occurred in the US when ACMG downgraded p.I148T from pathogenic to benign. I am not sure if there are any papers that were done at the time to address responsibility of the lab.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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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?
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