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Reviewer’s report:

major compulsory revision:
- there is no major compulsory revision also the abstract does not reflect the article well enough

Minor essential revision:
- the reference diagnosis was not established the same way in the 2 cohorts
- rebuilt the abstract, results are not clear (sensitivity, specificity of the rule in the derivation cohort should be more clearly expressed
- the conclusion in relation with the results. I would insist of the fact that the tool is not very sensitive but quite specific. When +, it could avoid additional exams.
- How useful can the tool be in practice should be more detailed and discussed

Dictionary Revision:
- you could detail the false + a bit more
- is figure 1 necessary?
- I don’t really understand the figure 3 in relation with the text and the legend of the figure does not explain the figure very well
- In the discussion, the order of the arguments could be revised. I propose to discuss the limitations of the study later in the text.
- the % should be more explained in the discussion, for example, 22% of sensitivity = 124/565 patients
- I propose that you rebuild the conclusion insisting more on the clinical importance of the rule (see above).

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.