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Reviewer's report:

Dear all:

First of all, congratulations for this study. taking in consideration the duration for the study it could be a great effort for recollecting those information. Hope you can find a good clue for a excellence draft.

Let me introduce the considerations as a major revision for this proposal:

1. Introduction: I think it needs a re-write. My reading of the state of the art is complex and heavy. I should recommend a simply description of this section for example "Some biomedical data belong .....subsets[10]" feel a little boring piece of text. think about 1 paragraph 1 idea, 1 sentence describe de simple essence of the resolution/problem.

2. Method: I feel loosing, where do you define this section? As an example: in result the draft expose the re-sampling (do you think this could be a method section?). Please be as clear as possible and try not to mix section to be simply and transparent.

3. Evaluation: I think you take a good approach, simple and easy to read. Perhaps I should explain better ROC graph.

4. Bibliography: I think you need to update this revision of the bibliography. References from 1994, 2001 should be taken a long time?

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.

No

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:

Acceptable
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Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
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