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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions:

I think the paper is well written, the data strong, and nicely presented with solid statistics. All major Copeptin work in the field is mentioned in the references.

My comments are trying to encourage the authors to commit themselves to recommendation for a practical application of their results for others:

1. The choice of cut-off for "elevated" is based on the original assay paper written by me. Whilst I feel honored, I suggest you discuss the topic of choosing a correct Copeptin cut-off for outcome prediction. Particulary, since the Keller et al. JACC paper used a population of 5000 people to define 99th and also 97th percentile. The 97th percentile was at 13 pmol/L. One might point out, that this population contains already confounding patients, which are simply not yet identified, and who push the 97th percentile higher. Looking at your data, it would not really matter much, if you do this analysis with 11.6 or 13 pmol/L as the cutoff. But I think it would be an important point for everybody in the future trying to apply your findings. Simply put: Which Copeptin in the ER do we call "elevated" and on what basis do we do that?

2. What was the 97th percentile of Copeptin in your population? The 95th percentile is already very high.

3. Is it possible to express the increase in mortality risk per increase in copetin concentration or log (ten fold) increase?

3. It would be more reader friendly to replace the letters in Figure 2 by the clinical subgroup instead of having to refere to the legend.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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