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Reviewer's report:

Very interesting topic and work.

Main suggestions for improvement:

You may consider to rewrite introduction with a clearer main aim of study, and stating the reasons for conducting the study. I understand that you have developed a tool (PHI) that you hypothesize will be more suitable for screening for psychological problems in patients opting for cancer genetic counseling, than HADS. In my view your main aim is therefore to compare PHI with HADS in your population? Have HADS shown in some way not to identify important psychological aspects, or do you believe the PHI is a better tool for describing nuances in psychological health in a population opting for cancer genetic counselling? I think it would be good to clarify if you are trying to validate this new tool for use in different populations or if you are giving a descriptive analysis of your population's psychological profile, which is of course also very interesting.

Your main conclusions and "next step" on the last pages will be linked to this. Is the main conclusion to draw from the results you present that this tool must be administered by psychologists trained in oncology? This will make your tool less used in the daily work of many departments I think, as I believe there are more doctors and genetic counsellors meeting these patients than psychologists.

p.12 First paragraph - Some of this could be moved to introduction.

p. 13 line 28: Why do you think you have a higher frequency of depression in your study compared to other studies on psychological problems in patients opting for Cancer Genetic Services? Was this found in both HADS and PHI?
Tables:

Need som more work, but the tables illustrate very nicely how PHI pinpoints details in problem areas, probably more broadly identified by HADS.

Please state HADS vs PHI on the relevant columns, as this will make it more intuitive to read.

Wording and phrases: Suggestions for improvement/simplifications:

p.2 line 8: Denominated = called

p.3 line 45: "affectations" is not a common English Word and must be defined, or use a different word

p.4 line 7: adherence = compliance?

p.4 line 12: Evaluation or intervention - what do mean by this?

p.4 Unclear paragraph: line 35 -40 starting with The Genetic Counseling Services...

Methods:

p.5 line 28-29: Maybe give percentage of patients going through With the study 110/180 = 61%

p.9 line 17: Remunerative = ?

Discussion

p.12 line 17: "focused on the psychological area" - unnecessary sentence?

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal