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Author’s response to reviews:

09.11.2017

Guangde Tu

Executive Editor

BMC Emergency Medicine
Dear Dr Guangde Tu

We thank you for considering our manuscript, “EMMD-D-17-00006- The association between duration of emergency department boarding and the outcome of patients admitted to the intensive care unit” for publication in BMC Emergency Medicine.

We thank the reviewers for their positive feedback and valuable comments. Please see the detailed point by point response to these comments. In addition changes have also been made to the manuscript, which has significantly improved it. We hope that the manuscript will be accepted for publication.

Sincerely
Abdulaziz Al-Dawood, MD, FRCPC, FCCP
Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
P.O. Box 22490 Riyadh 11426
Telephone: +966-11-8011111 x18899 / x18855 / x18877
Fax: +966-11-8011111 x18880
Email: dawooda@ngha.med.sa

Editor Comments:

Comment 1
Please provide the following terms in Declaration section,
- Authors’ Contributions (Contribution of each authors should be clarified.)
- Acknowledgements

Reply
Comment 2

Please add a section "List of abbreviations" before "Declaration" section.

Reply

Done

Reviewer comments:

General comments

I am not English native but I feel that the manuscript still needs English editing and revision services provided by one of the many sites available. Some examples are: on page 35, line 59, "Group 1" should be written "Group I"; the abbreviation "MVA" is not needed, since it appears only once; on page 40, line 38 he phrase is missing a parenthesis ");"; on page 40 "group 1" is misspelled again; page 41, line 12 should be written "odds"; page 41, line 23 the p value is missing its sign (< or >); page 42, line 17, "form" should be substituted by "from". But again, I am not a professional editor and I think the manuscript would be clearer and easier to understand after a professional English edition service.

Reply

Thank you so much for your valuable comments. They are certainly helpful and have improved the manuscript big time. All the above mentioned mistakes have been corrected in addition to improving the English language to make it more legible and comprehensive.

Comment 1

In abstract authors did not provide the changes suggested. I still suggest that authors should state more clearly the outcomes of the present study. In methods section, there should be a brief description of main variables analyzed and plans for statistical analysis. In conclusions authors mention mortality as an outcome, although there is no description of this data in results, the last phrase of conclusions should be excluded, since it is not supported by findings of the present study. I could not find your key words in the list of MeSH (Medical Subject Headings), they should be changed.

Reply
The changes requested have been included.

Methods

Following sentence regarding the analysis has been added:

“We carried out multivariate analysis to examine the independent association of boarding time with the outcome adjusting for variables like age, sex, APACHE, Mechanical ventilation, Creatinine, Platelets, INR”

Results

Data about the outcome has been included in the results section as follows;

“Hospital mortality was lower in group I and it increased with the increase in boarding {51(22.5), 104(29.1), 132(37.2), P=0.0006}. There was a significant increase in the ICU LOS with increase in boarding duration [9.55 days (Group II), 9.8 (Group II) and 10.6 (Group III), (P= 0.002)] and the duration of ventilation also increased with the increase in the boarding time[5.9 ± 8.9 days (Group II), 6.5 ± 8.1 (Group II) and 10.6± 10.5 (Group III), P= 0.04]. In addition, the delay in admission was an independent risk factor for ICU mortality(OR for group III vs group I is 1.90, P= 0.04) and hospital mortality(OR for group III vs Group I is 2.09, P= 0.007)”

The key words have been changed as advised.

Comment 2

In results, tables are still not formatted according to the journal. They should not be closed on its left and right sides. Furthermore, there are still some abbreviations not included in the legends (such as: SD, ER).

Reply

The tables have been formatted as per the journal requirement. In addition all the abbreviations have been included.

Comment 3
The manuscript is missing the conclusion. In the first revision, I suggested excluding the last phrase, because it was not supported by YOUR results. But there are important conclusions to be drawn from your results and they should be considered in this section of your manuscript. ED boarding was frequent in your sample and was independently associated with worse morbidity and mortality.

Reply

The conclusion section has been added.