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Reviewer's report:

My comments were summarized in the previous report. Almost all of them were addressed by the authors, many (but not all) of them in a satisfactory (or correct) manner and contributed to the increased quality of the paper.

To account for and defend my positions in detail in the rest of the comments and pointing out all the remaining imperfections found in the present manuscript would be inadequately time consuming. I know it is details, but nevertheless wonder why the authors did not take the time to correct all minor spelling errors (e.g. "spesificity" or "charasteristics") in the tables and/or captions.

I must, however, answer one question posed by the authors regarding data interpretation. As a clinical biochemist whose primary focus is on clinical data interpretation, I was not arguing against the difference in the trends observed in the L/P and L/G ratios (I think I am quite aware of the biochemistry of these simple metabolites) but rather their variability... Regarding the "specificity" of glycerol - I was just citing their own article. Glycerol can by no means be considered a "specific indicator of gut epithelial damage", even though it was documented to correlate with cell damage in a number of papers. For example, serum AST is routinely used as an indicator of (and in numerous studies also correlates with) hepatal tissue damage, but cannot be considered a "liver-specific" indicator, since it is found in many other tissues including skeletal or cardiac muscle and its increased serum catalytic concentration can be observed even following sample haemolysis. Compare this issue with e.g. oncomarkers on one hand and e.g. cardiac troponine on the other.

Such argumentation and explanation of individual points could go on and on... Since my previous comments will be published along with the article, I can see no point in continuing a lengthy discussion and will now opt for publishing the article. The authors may (and will) get the important feedback by the peers in the field.
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