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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made a major effort to clarify their paper and respond to the queries.

I have one major comment left: the authors have now made it clear that that left kidneys were used as training data, and the right kidneys as test data. How can this be justified, in view of the fact that LN is a symmetric disease (unlike renal artery stenosis, for instance)? This means that any values extracted from the left kidney should be identical, or very close to, those of the right kidney for any individual patient. In any case they should be very highly correlated, so I don't see how they can act as a valid set of test data.

Two smaller points: apologies, in comments 6&7 I referred to the wrong page. Instead of p7, 25 and p7, 51 this should have read p8, 25 and p8, 51.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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