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Reviewer’s report:

Minor revisions
Background page 4, line 19: I suggest “multidisciplinary medical/surgical (M/S)”
Methods, setting page 5, line 9 instead of “the three PICUs” I suggest “the three M/S PICUs”
Methods data collection page 5, line 16: I suggest to add “all consecutive” , line 22 instead of “sex” I suggest “gender”
I suggest to change in all the paper the two words cardiosurgery and cardiosurgical with cardiac surgery and cardiac surgical
I suggest to change in all the paper “non surgical” in “medical”

Discretionary revisions
Results: it could be useful to add how the 7 missing death children are distributed for age and main reason of admission.
Discussion page 10 line 1: it is not clear when the authors comment the higher risk of death for neonate and newborn resulted from the multivariate analysis. They reported that independently from PIM2 score, these two age categories have a higher risk of death, and seems to justify this result with a poor calibration of the PIM score. I think this is not an appropriate explanation.
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