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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor, dear Authors,

It was a great pleasure for me to review the manuscript "Recognition and treatment of severe sepsis in the Emergency Department: survey in two French teaching hospitals" that investigates some of the main limitations in severe sepsis diagnosis in the ED.

I think the article should be accepted because of the significance of the argument investigated and of the results reported, but it will require MAJOR REVISION.

Hereafter my considerations:

METHODS:

- As SIRS' and severe sepsis' criteria are not mentioned above, more precise description should be reported in methods, or otherwise in Table 1.

- A retrospective screening of electronic charts doesn't represent an accurate way to calculate delays in the diagnosis. How did you calculate it? from the admission to the discharge to ward/ICU?

STATISTICS and RESULTS:

- How did you check for normality of the variables?

- Table 1 reports discrepancies between numbers and corresponding percentages (for example: Number of comorbidities: total=130 pts, Percentage 99%).

Again, table 1: priority of triage (ND in 2 patients that should be 1.5%, not 15%)

Therefore I suggest additional statistical review.
It would be also relevant to know more about your study population (level of lactate, BP, HR, fluids before decision to start norepinephrine infusion).

Best regards,

Prof Abele Donati

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

No

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

No

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

Unable to assess

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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