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"

Rossarin Karnpean[1]

1 Srinakharinwirot University

Comments to the Authors

This is an interesting report on the outcome of NIPT. Thank you on the work you have done.

I have some comments:

Page 3

1. Authors should mention the program that use for data analysis in methods.

Page 4

2. In table 1: for ethnicity item, please change all list in the table to the same pattern, not country.

Page 7

3. In table 3 and 4: authors should give explanation of all number that express in the parenthesis such range or percentage in table captions.

4. In table 4: authors should add "%" in (2.4), (2.2), (8.5), (6.9) as the same pattern as present in table 3.

5. The number in sentence "Of the 83 with low or insufficient results,**18 (9.0%)** were in the consanguineous group, compared to **63 (6.9%)** in the non-consanguineous group (P>0.05)." were not the same as shown in table 4. Please re-check data.

Page 8

6. Do the explanations of table 5 and table 6 switch position? please re-check data.

7. In table 5: "30^{+}" is not the same pattern as other gestational age such as "21^{+0}-24^{+0}, likely that the day is disappear.

Page 9

8. In table 6:

- authors should give abbreviation such as what is NA and NT stand for.

- GA should be presented in the same pattern as in table 5

- Is "ff%" be the same as Fraction% in table 3 and %fFDNA in table 4, if so, authors should use the same word in consistency.

- How do the authors arrange data? The lists of cases could be reordered by NIFT or indication for easy understanding.