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Reviewer's report:

Fisher’s Exact Test
I am not sure that the Fisher’s Exact Test is the right test for what the authors are interested in testing. I understand this was a recommendation from another reviewer, but I still would like to see a justification for the use of the Fisher’s Exact Test. For example, in Table 1, the Fisher’s Exact Test is assessing whether there is an association between type of subject (patient and controls) and the type of Pcom. However, the table legend mentions “differences between SD and controls”, which is the incorrect interpretation for the Fisher’s Exact Test. The same applies for Table 2. The authors really need to explain what the Fisher’s Exact Test is supposed to test.

Sample Size Increase
I am uncomfortable with this procedure. The authors cannot simple increase the experimental sample size as they please to meet their targets. There some obvious questions that one would like to ask in this case:
1) Why these extra patients were excluded from the original experiment?
2) Would the authors add these patients if the results were to be different?

Usually, the correct way forward when this type of extensions are used is to correct the level of significance. So, instead of a 0.05 significance level, this would have to be reduced by some quantity. This is quite complicated and I am not sure what would be the best way, but I am willing to consider potential solutions.

Regardless of the aforementioned correction, it is essential that this extension is described clearly in the paper, so the reader knows that the number of controls was extended. And reasons for the extension should also be provided.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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