

# Review of: "Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT) for Aneuploidy in a Setting with a High Consanguineous Rate – A Retrospective Cohort Review of 1,153 Cases"

Elzette Nienaber<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> National Health Laboratory Service

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting study and unique. I commend the authors on undertaking this research, which is much needed.

## Comments

- Grammar issues
- Abbreviations should not be in the title
- In the Abstract, don't start a sentence with a number
- Be consistent with how results are reported (preferably give number and percentage 5/20; 25%)
- Numbers under 10 are usually written out
- Consistency in writing style (e.g., This was mainly for three aneuploidies (T13, T18, T21) and monosomy 45XO)
- "This approach is associated with a false positive rate of up to 5%. Hence, a proportion of women who undergo invasive testing (with the associated risk of miscarriage) will be those with false positive results." It is unclear what is meant by this sentence. Are you saying that invasive testing has a false positive rate of 5%, or screening has a false positive rate and some women will undergo invasive testing unnecessarily?
- Is there a difference in the sensitivity and specificity of the different commercial NIPT tests offered?
- Table 1: You say in the text that 220 were Caucasian; however, in the table, this group also consists of a range of different individuals, including Chinese, Asian, etc.
- Could you comment on why no sex chromosome abnormalities were detected?
- Were these women given the option to know the sex of the baby when doing NIPT? Were they counselled?