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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The abstract is in my opinion a good clinical study. The matter discussed has a high relevance in the day to day routine in surgery and very little helpful papers have been published on this subject.

Therefore the back testing of scoring systems is important. The question is well defined and relevant.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

The paper presents a good clinical study. The methods are right and clear. The evaluation was thoroughly done.

3. Are the data sound?

The number of cases could be higher but that seems to be acceptable given the relatively short time frame under discussion.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes. It’s o.k.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion and conclusions are clear and good structured.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

The limitations are mentioned.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

As stated earlier there is very little further work on the subject.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

The result of the study is clear and discussed.
9. Is the writing acceptable?

The paper is well done, good structured and in good language. The English is fine.