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Reviewer’s report:

General

The major modifications provided by authors significantly increase the interest of the paper.

Material and methods was improved, and the discussion section now explains the interest of the methodology and the potential drawbacks of the technology used.

In my opinion, even if the results are somehow weakened by the fact that patients samples were analyzed only once, the paper is now acceptable for publication in BMC Cancer

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

none

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The supplementary figures are not cited in the text and should appear in the result section. These figures must be available for readers, not only for reviewers.

The abbreviation BPS should be explained in the text.

Page 11, last paragraph, “spectroscopy” has been employed (instead of “spectrometry”?)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The biomarkers identified were not further used in order to discriminate the groups. It should have been interesting to know if a classification tree using the biomarkers work better or not than biomarker pattern software. This point was not assessed, even if asked by reviewer 3.
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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