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- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Results: table 1 shows comparison of data between persons who had a 30 days survival and all the Study subjects. There is no basis for such a comparison. Stating the clinical data of the study subjects is sufficient. You may also compare the clinical and biochemical parameters between survivors and those that ended up dead. For clarity clinical parameters and biochemical parameters should be placed on different tables to reduce table length.

2. A comparison of the distribution of the three types of HEs among survivors and those who died should be made and results displayed by means of a bar chart.

3. What other parameters were Odds ratio computed for apart from the three showed in Table 2? These should be shown in table 2.

4. In the discussion, you stated that this is a retrospective study yet earlier on you stated that it is a prospective study. How do you reconcile these statements?

5. The implication of elevated creatinine is more likely that of renal impairment rather than infection but this was not discussed.

6. In clinical practice, blood PH and effective serum osmolality are important for evaluating hyperglycemic crises. Interestingly, these two factors were not mortality predictors. - This statement is not backed by your results.

7. Objectively substantiate the claim about the source of sepsis not germane to mortality prediction.

- Minor Essential Revisions: Abstract

1. The aims and endpoint of the study should be properly outlined in the abstract.

2. The authors should give some background information about what is already known about hyperglycaemic crises in Taiwan. All the info you gave focused only on the USA.

3. Methods: Insufficient information was retrospectively collected by reviewers checking medical records after the patients had been discharged from the hospital. - What does this statement mean?
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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