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Reviewer's report:

The association between duration of emergency department boarding and the outcome of patients admitted to the intensive care unit

Authors submit a manuscript presenting a relevant issue that involves the emergency department and intensive care units. There are some interesting data described in this paper but I still have some concerns that should be addressed.

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.

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.

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).
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.

**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.

Yes

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

No

**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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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