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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper by Le Conte and co-workers entitled "Recognition and treatment of severe sepsis in the Emergency Department: survey in two French teaching hospitals”.

The study deals with the assessment of the compliance with the Severe Sepsis Campaign 3-hour bundle and the analysis of the delay of severe sepsis recognition and description in two French hospitals.

The study is interesting, actual and well written.

Only few concerns have arisen while reading the manuscript. I have listed them below.

During the last six months, two milestone have been released: The third definition of sepsis (Singer at al. The Third International Consensus Definitions for Sepsis and Septic Shock (Sepsis-3) ) that eliminated the "severe sepsis" and the new Surviving Sepsis Guidelines 2016 (Rhodes et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016”).

These two fundamental documents should be included and properly commented in the paper by the authors.

The following statement, "The advanced age and the presence of cardiac comorbidities might explain this result because physicians might fear fluid overloading”, is very interesting. I would like to suggest the authors to add some comments taking into consideration the role of ultrasounds in evaluating these patients according to the more recent SSC guidelines 2016.

Finally, some TYPOs and grammatical errors need to be corrected in a language editing process.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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