Response to Reviewer 1

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript presents full scope review of the published literature concerning psychological impact of inconclusive results from geneitc testing to define cancer risk. It reveals data reporting general distress, anxiety, depression, test-specific distress. It provides careful outline of the main findings which may be useful to refine strategies for management of uncertaintly and counseling in such cases.

We want to thank the Reviewer for appreciating our manuscript.

Response to the Editorial Office's Comments

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a systematic review of psychological outcomes for the uncertainty following an inconclusive result from the BRCA1/2 genetic test. The topic is within the scope of the WJP. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript presents full scope review of the published literature concerning psychological impact of inconclusive results from genetic testing to define cancer risk. It reveals data reporting general distress, anxiety, depression, test-specific distress; (3) Format: There are 2 tables and 1 figure; (4) References: A total of 53 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are 2 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2

Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Proof-Reading-Service was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJP.

Issues raised:

(1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

Following the Editorial Office's Comment, we have added the "Author Contributions" section.

(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Following the Editorial Office's Comment, we have provided the PowerPoint of the figure documents.

(3) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Following the Editorial Office's Comment, we have added the "Article Highlights" section.