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Reviewer's report:

The title and abstract are appropriate. The writing is clear and concise throughout. The authors address a valuable research question and develop a sufficient rationale. The methods are appropriate and described fairly well. The data appear sound and are reported within the standards. The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and are supported by the data. The authors do not reach for discussion points that are beyond the scope of their study or their data. The limitations are well described and comprehensive. The major limitation is the fact that the evaluators could not be blinded to group allocation. This is often the case with similar studies and if often unavoidable.

I have no minor essential or major compulsory revisions (which is a first for me).

Discretionary Revisions

1. Consider adding more detailed descriptions of the clinical tests in the figure legend and the text. If the figures can be edited, consider adding lines or arrows to clarify the measures. Consider including a ‘positive’ result along with the ‘negative’ for each test (as appropriate).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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