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Dear Editor,

RE: MS: 7655004815910365 - The role of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations in prostate, pancreatic and stomach cancers.

Thank you for the positive comments on our manuscript. We have made a point-by-point response to the Reviewers’ comments as outlined in the following pages, using blue font to indicate our reply. In this latest version of the revised manuscript we have indicated the in-text changes using green font to highlight the revisions in this version compared to the previous revisions which remain in blue (for your convenience).

We hope that these revisions are satisfactory and that our manuscript is now acceptable for publication. Should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact us (k.rogers@qub.ac.uk).

Yours sincerely,

________________________
Dr. K. Rogers and Ms H Cavanagh.
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Version: 4  Date: 22 June 2015
Reviewer: Bente Talseth-Palmer
Reviewer's report:
Article reads well, happy with the changes made. Thank you.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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Reviewer's report
Title: The role of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations in prostate, pancreatic and stomach cancers.
Version: 4 Date: 17 June 2015
Reviewer: Elizabeth Bancroft
Reviewer's report:
The revisions that have been made have improved this manuscript and I hope the authors find the following comments helpful in finalising this for publication.
Compulsory Revisions
(1) The aim of the review
The last sentence of introduction states that:
“This report reviews the most relevant available literature on the association of BRCA1/2 genes with cancers other than breast and ovarian. The principle aim being to evaluate and critically discuss whether there is an association between mutations in BRCA1/2 genes and cancers other than breast and ovarian.”
As suggested previously I do not think this accurately describes what you are reporting. I recommend changing this to:
“This report reviews the most relevant available literature on the association of BRCA1/2 genes with prostate, pancreatic and stomach cancers”
Done
I also suggest changing the abstract wording to reflect this:
“This review examines the association of BRCA1/2 germline gene mutations with cancers other than breast and ovarian and incorporates critical analysis on the correlation of prostate, pancreatic and stomach cancers with BRCA1/2 gene mutations”
It might be clearer to re-phrase to state:
“This review examines the association of BRCA1/2 germline gene mutations with prostate, pancreatic and stomach cancers”
Done
(2) The prostate cancer section provides conclusions about BRCA2, it would be helpful to provide a summary of your findings about BRCA1.
Two sentences which summarise the impact of both BRCA1/2 mutations on prostate cancer are included at the end of paragraph 1 (under the title Impact of BRCA1/2 for prostate cancer).
(3) As above it would be helpful to have a summary sentence for both BRCA1 and BRCA2 concluding what the review has found for both pancreatic cancer and stomach cancer.
Done.
(4) Conclusion:
This section would benefit from teasing out what you have found for BRCA1 vs what you have found for BRCA2. For both prostate and pancreatic cancer your review highlights that there is good evidence for a link with BRCA2 but that there is conflicting evidence around their link with BRCA1. This also seems to be the conclusion about stomach cancer. You have added a sentence at the end, but this should be stated at the start and then the rest of the conclusion amended to reflect this.
Conclusion: paragraph 2 - I do not follow this paragraph. Are you talking about aggregation of all types of cancer in mutation positive families? Or are you referring to the aggregation of the cancers reviewed?
Phrase added for clarification.
Discretionary revisions
(1) It would be helpful to include the fact that only articles freely available as full-text in the limitations of the review.
Done (in the conclusion section)
(2) Prostate cancer, paragraph 3: “Another study showed that two of 290 participants possessed germline protein-truncating BRCA2 mutations.” suggest rewording as follows: “Another study showed that two of 290 participants with prostate cancer possessed germline protein-truncating BRCA2 mutations.” Done

(3) BRCA1/2 mutations and Prostate Cancer Survival Rate: Last two sentences: two groups are described, these need to be defined as it is not clear to the reader what this refers to. These sentences have been removed.

(4) BRCA1/2 mutations in pancreatic cancer, last para: first sentence could be removed as this study is a series of Hereditary pancreatic cancer cases with no BRCA1/2 mutations and therefore not as relevant to this review. Ok, agreed. Done.

(5) Impact of BRCA1/2 mutations in other associated cancers: I would remove references [24,33] from this section as you are talking about your overall findings, not just findings from these two papers. Agreed, done.

(6) Implications for male BRCA1/2 mutation carriers: paragraph 1. You could add a sentence to this section to state that the findings of your review highlight that there are cancer risks for men and therefore BRCA1/2 mutation screening has relevance for men in their own right, rather than just to inform risk for relatives. This would link this section to the rest of the review. Thank you for this suggestion. A sentence has been added to highlight this.
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