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Reviewer's report:

Dr. Roest and colleagues investigated the predictive value and feasibility of the abbMEDS and CURB-65 in sepsis patients at the ED and the relationship between the scores and antibiotic treatment and disposition. The results are significant and may further contribute to the current clinical decisions in the treatment of sepsis at ED. However, necessary revisions are needed to improve the manuscript.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Considering CURB-65 in mostly used for predicting mortality only in community-acquired pneumonia, the author should list necessary reasons why using CURB-65 in this sepsis population with different infection sources in the introduction section.

2. One important purpose of this study was to compare the predictive value and feasibility between two scores. Accordingly, the p values of the comparisons are supposed to be clearly indicated in the Tables/Figures, as well as in the main text.

3. In the current study, the sepsis was defined as SIRS + either suspected or proven infection. What is the proportion of suspected/proven infection?

Minor Essential Revisions
1. The author should list three defined risk categories (e.g. low, intermediate and high) in the main text when first mentioned.

2. In Table 3, some of data was not correctly expressed as n(%).

3. Page 11 Line 7: "wel" should be "well".

4. There are some repeated data which were presented both in Tables or Figures.

5. Typo: In figure 2-4, the symbol ",," was replaced by "." (e.g. 15,7 should be 15.7)
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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