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Reviewer's report:

The paper has been somewhat improved.

There are still too many abbreviations for me, especially in the "Results", "Discussion" and "Conclusion" chapters, which makes reading really difficult and challenging. The "Discussion" chapter is still too long, should avoid digressions and be more targeted, forgetting any hypothetical extrapolation not based on available evidence.

I remain persuaded, despite the arguments of the authors, that the interpretation of small series should systematically, even if they are close to Gaussian distributions, based on non-parametric tests. But I know this is a frequent matter of debate between the purists and the pragmatists. The representation of so few data data by their mean value and their standard deviation is misleading, not showing the full distribution of the obtained values. A complete box-and-whiskers plot representation, also including extreme values, is more honest for me.

Concerning the ROC curve analysis: what are the corresponding positive predictive value and negative predictive value? Do they really reach a level allowing medical decision? The real medical meaning should be detailed.

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

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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