

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"

Shengjie Gao¹

¹ Beijing Genomics Institute

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study was a retrospective cohort study of couples who underwent NIPT screening, specifically consanguinity couples. The aim of the study was to provide valuable insights into whether there is an effect of consanguinity being related on fetal NIPT screening by reviewing the screening population, considering factors such as age and obesity. To further improve the quality of the paper, I offer the following suggestions.

1. The abstract mentions "low risk women", but it does not appear in the text.
2. The article mentions that "83 (7.2%) had low or insufficient results", what is meant by "low results", the author should make it clear, and is "low results" the same as "low risk"?
3. The criteria for consanguinity are?
4. "The failure to obtain a result was 8.5% in the consanguineous group", but $216 \times 8.5\% = 18.36$, the number of people will not be a decimal, please describe the number of people clearly.
5. The numbers in the table4 table are 212+941, but the author's full text states that there is a consanguinity of 216.
6. What are the authors trying to express in table5, table6, which do not seem to be related to consanguinity and cfDNA levels?