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Reviewer's report:

Two discretionary comments

1. Page 8 The old sentence (i.e., a sentence in the original submission) of “… would not have shown anything ….” as worded does not seem to follow the new sentence added right before it. You seem to mean (correct me, if I'm wrong) that such a flawed allocation of subjects to groups along with the actual therapies received lacks assay sensitivity (can not reveal any difference between therapies that may exist).

2. Page 10 I prefer “in Rothmann” instead of “developed by Rothmann” (as I see that this was not a blinded referee report)
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