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Reviewer's report:

The authors have appropriately addressed all but one of my concerns. In my first review I raised the point that application of a single model might again lead to the implementation of an inferior model. The authors do now state in the methods section that they do not want to produce a "perfect prediction model (which is impossible anyhow)". This statement is off-topic. It also raises suspicion that the authors might not be interested in producing a model that performs best. To my understanding this should be the actual research goal, especially against the background of the medical outcome. A reference to "over-optimism" is also not helpful, as modern benchmark studies provide methods for unbiased performance evaluation. To me it is not clear why an inferior model should be accepted.
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