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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting applied study of considerable practical interest. It uses standard statistical tools to reach appealing conclusions. It should be published. Below, we list some points and details which should be modified/corrected before the publication.

The sentence “The mean age was 44 years and women comprised 65% of the population.” is highly misleading and should be changed. The word “population” is completely inappropriate here. Something like “sample” is to be used.

The word “sensibility” on the vertical axis of the Figure 1 should be replaced by “sensitivity”.

In the Figure 2 (UDE-Score), there appears Age as one of the explanatory variable. Reading the part of the text referring to the Figure 2, it is probably wrong to write 0.7age in the formula. From the text on page 8 (“…logistic regression of age > 48 years...”), it seems that we should have something like: with being an indicator function (assuming 1 if its argument is true and 0 if it is false). This would amount to 0.7age for age over 48 and 0 for age less than or equal to 48. Alternatively, we might have which amounts to 0.7 for age over 47 and 0 otherwise. One cannot tell from the text what of the two possibilities (or even some other, more exotic variant) was used. The paper should specify the model and the score unambiguously (as it would be quite dangerous for a user to take one interpretation, where in fact the other was used by the authors). This can be achieved via indicator function formalism (being used as one component in the full model/score specification) as above, or via other description. Nevertheless, the description should be clear and unequivocal.