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Reviewer's report:

Lykke Syse et al performed a restrospective study which aims at the description of patients treated for acute recreational drug toxicity, and aims at describing gender difference in clinical state and toxic agents.

General comments:

Unfortunately, the paper does not follow the STROBE guidelines. I suggest that the authors revise the manuscript according the STROBE guidelines, and add a STROBE checklist to the resubmission.

Background

It is not clear, why the study was performed, please clarify.

Scientific background is presented, but should be more comprehensive. The authors might elaborate the gap of knowledge, why this study is necessary, and present the objectives more clearly.

Methods:

Design: The authors should state that this is a retrospective study.

Participants: Here already results are presented, this should be shifted to the result section. Eligibility criteria and exclusion criteria should be presented more clearly.

Outcome measures: Here, objectives are presented, but not outcomes. Objectives should be described clearly in the Introduction section, not in method section. Describe outcomes in the statistic section.

Statistics: Please clearly define predictors and outcomes here. Describe all statistical methods
Results: Present results according to STROBE guidelines

Discussion: Please discuss the relevance of the study for clinical practice.

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

Unable to assess

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.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal