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Reviewer’s report:

General

----------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

----------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Table 3 and 4. The predicted mortality odds ratio and p value are not well explained. Is the Table 3 mortality odds ratio for the measured vs predicted of the entire pooled population? If so, my interpretation is that the difference between the values is significant p<0.001. A legend on the tables would resolve that confusion.

----------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1) If it is possible to post an on-line supplement with the sedation protocol, rather than emailing the author, that may be beneficial to the reader.

2) Could discuss the benefit of added through-put by reducing the LOS 0.7 days, depending on the average occupancy or need to delay ER admissions pending bed availability.

3) Could extrapolate their mortality reduction impact to comment on their contribution to the Saving Lives Campaign.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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