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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for a nice paper, with an interesting topic. I have only minor comments.

Abstract: First sentence should be rewritten to clarify meaning.

Question: Is the number of families 7 / 269 low to be a possible founder?

Background

p 3 line 30 Score, not Sore

p 3 line 44: the prevalence of BRCA mutationS WERE

p 5 line 12 each variant, not variation.

p5 line 15, please state the name of the database, BIC.

Why was not ACMG or ENIGMA criteria for variant classification used?

p 6 NCCN guidelines.

It is hardly a surprise that NCCN criteria is fulfilled, since all patients were referred because there was increased risk of having a mutation?

Can you explain why Manchester score did not discriminate. Maybe here or in discussion section. (p 8)

Results

p 7 line 4 were been.. "been" could be deleted

p 7 line 12 is the variant c.2254_2257delGACT a BRCA1 or BRCA2 variant?
Discussion: p 7 and 8, it is briefly touched upon that this variant recently has been classified as pathogenic according to ClinVar, and not BIC. As previously mentioned the use of BIC as referance database is a Limited Source of information. Are the other variants listed in the tables reported to Clinvar by another lab?

p 8 Same as mentioned earlier, in line 41-43 it ways that MAnchester score failed to discriminate carriers. Why is it so?

p 9 line 14 -15 is the variant c.798_799delTT in BRCA1 or BRCA2?

Good luck on finishing the paper.

Best wishes.
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