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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have very adequately addressed all the issues I described from their initial submission. I have only minor points to suggest.

p. 3. The sentence about personality traits seems misplaced in a section about neurobiology.

p. 3. "elusive" would probably be better as "incomplete."

p. 4 and p. 11. "fRMI" should be fMRI. (This happens in other parts of the manuscript as well.)

p. 4. The reference to Ponseti et al. should include that that was a study of men who admitted their pedophilia.

p. 6. "data was" should be "data were"

p. 6. The mention of the Ethics Committee should be adjacent to the mention of informed consent.

p. 6. The samples should be described as "heterosexual paedophilic" instead of just "paedophilic" at their first mention.

p. 9. Monte Carlo should be two words.

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