Authors response to the Reviewers comments

First of all, we thank the Editor and the Reviewer for the opportunity of submitting a revised version of our work. We tracked changes in red font color in the revised manuscript, following the Reviewer suggestion.

Reviewer 2:

I think most of my comments were reflected. However, the result of 100 times resamplings was not given to the paper. I believe that the paper should include the result of at least 100 times of resampling to increase the quality of the paper for IJMS.

We thank the reviewer for the comment. According to the suggestion we now re-run all the codes with 100 resamplings and consequently updated all results. The new figures in the main manuscript and Supplementary Figures.docx show the average predictive accuracy computed across 100 resamplings. Analogously, Table 1 in the main manuscript and tables in Supplementary Tables.xlsx report the average values and 95% CI computed across 100 resamplings. The newly generated figures resemble the previous ones, i.e. those with 50 resamplings: this was expected, as suggested by our previous sensitivity analysis (see the answers to the previous round of reviews). However, increasing the number of resamplings to 100 resulted in even narrower confidence intervals.

In thanking the Reviewer, we confirm that we thoroughly checked the manuscript and included all the updated results. We are confident that this round of reviews has further improved the quality of the manuscript for IJMS.