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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary revisions

1) The authors use the word "data" in the singular -- viz '... and the necessary data to calculate these score is (sic) unlikely to be found ...' and '... data for study participants during their ICU stay was (sic) recorded prospectively ...' etc.

2) If (in the statistical analysis section) '... C-statistics of .. 0.7 to 0.8 are considered adequate and C-statistics below 0.7 are regarded as poor', shouldn't the Charlson index result be similarly described (in the abstract results) rather than saying it was '.. only a fair predictor of mortality (C=0.626)'

Incidental comment

It was refreshing to read a paper about such an arcane subject written with clarity and simplicity of style.
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