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Reviewer's report:

p. 6, line 106: The authors have significantly simplified the presentation, which makes the paper read better and makes the results clear. This reviewer is not expert on the topic of classification modelling or validation by clustering algorithms, and while the audience of this journal does not likely need to know all of the technical details, there should be enough of a description in the methods that the results could be checked or duplicated by another investigator. I feel that this version was a little too stripped of detail. Could the authors provide a few more sentences on how the validation and modelling was carried out?

p. 7 line 126: Is the age of diagnosis equal to the age at which treatment was initiated, or is there an additional gap between diagnosis and therapy? It is important for the reader to be able to distinguish between day of life at which NBS result is reported to the family vs. day at which sweat test confirmation took place vs. day of life on which therapy was initiated.

p. 9 line 177: Is there a way to more clearly state that the later the day of life that therapy is initiated, the poorer the growth outcomes? This might then prompt more discussion of justification for earlier reporting of NBS results for earlier initiation of therapy. Is there any evidence from the data that very early diagnosis (even from a positive family history or prenatal testing) with immediate initiation of treatment impacts outcome?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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