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Reviewer's report:

Kaiwar et al present an interesting case report with an important message.

I have a small number of comments that could be considered to improve the presentation.

1. I commend the authors for referring to "variants" in MEN1 -rather than using an array of confusing and ill-defined vocabulary that can be used in similar genetics papers. However, if the authors are associating these variants with disease susceptibility that should be stated. For example, at page 2 line 25-6 "About 10-20% patients with familial MEN1 do not have a detectable variant in the MEN1 gene". I assume "variants" in this instance is referring to variants that are known/predicted to be associated with disease risk? This should be clarified. Similar issue at page 2 line 33-4.

2. Page 3 Line 46. It is not clear to me what is meant by "variation in this residue". Are the authors referring to the amino acid or to the nucleotide? Could this be rephrased for clarity? Are these variants predicted to make any protein?

3. Please state the MEN1 genetic variant/s that is/are relevant to page 3 line 45, reference 9.

4. The word propositus and proband seem to be used interchangeably - perhaps proband is the more widely recognized and could be used throughout?

5. Does the last sentence mean to propose that once identified a person with MEN1 should be carefully screened for MEN1 related cancers OR that medical geneticists should carefully screen people to enable the identification of people with MEN1 (or both) - this is not clear with the current sentence.

Very nice paper.
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