

We thank all reviewers for their time invested in this review, especially the substantive recommendations to change this publication for the better. We have implemented all minor recommendations as laid out by the reviewers, there is no need to list these one by one. We have especially expanded on some of the ethical issues and added lacking citations.

In the following we discuss each of the issues raised by the reviewers, starting with what we think are the most important concerns.

### **Issue: Quality of the Survey**

In concordance with the recommendations of the PLOS ONE editors we have completely removed the survey from the manuscript in the first revision of the article already and focussed on the database part of the manuscript instead. This negates the need to respond to each point raised by the reviewers in relation to the survey and the methods used for it.

### **Issue: Ethical Concerns**

In the introduction and the discussion we have focussed more on the potential ethical concerns, how individuals might get re-identified (cited Gymrek & Sweeney) and what kinds of discrimination might follow, even while GINA and the German equivalent are in place. We also made clear that Darst et al. do not focus on general sharing but on sharing with healthcare providers instead.

### **Issues: Introduction**

We've added more details on why GWAS are still an important method, why the Personal Genome Project isn't open to everyone and on the potential value of openSNP to scientists and users alike.

### **Issues: Discussion**

We added a brief introductory paragraph for the discussion and added further details about the ethical implications and possible problems with openly sharing genetic data (i.e. discrimination) and extended the paragraphs on the problems and benefits of GWAS.

We again thank all reviewers for their input.