

Editorial Note: this manuscript has been previously reviewed at another journal that is not operating a transparent peer review scheme. This document only contains reviewer comments and rebuttal letters for versions considered at Nature Communications.

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS:

Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have responded appropriately to prior critiques, and significantly improved the manuscript. Clearly further studies in primary patient samples will be required to establish the positive and negative predictive value of this assay, which appears to be rapid and reproducible.

Reviewer #2:

Remarks to the Author:

1. The authors have responded appropriately to prior critiques, and significantly improved the manuscript. Clearly further studies in primary patient samples will be required to establish the positive and negative predictive value of this assay, which appears to be rapid and reproducible.

We appreciate the reviewers' comments, which we agree have considerably improved the manuscript. Our thanks to the reviewers for their high-quality input.