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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to the editor and reviewers

Thank you for taking the time and effort to review our manuscript. We appreciate your constructive comments, which have helped to improve the manuscript. Below follows the comments and our responses.

Editor: We notice that authors Henrik Andersson, Anders Bremer and Lars Ljungstrom are missing from the authors' contributions section.

Authors comment: We are sorry for being unclear. The individual contributions of all authors in the manuscript are now specified in the Authors’ Contributions section (page 17, line 385-392).

Editor: Please also add a section “Supplementary files” where you list the following information about your supplementary material:

- File name
- Title of data
Reviewer 4: The objective of the study was to compare characteristics between patients with and without adverse outcomes during their hospital stays. It makes sense to use an independent sample t-test and chi-square analysis. Under methods, you do not mention that you are using an independent sample t-test and chi-square analysis. Instead, you mention that you are using a multivariate logistic regression. Logistic regression is a predictive analysis. I do not believe that is the purpose or objective for this study. If it is, please state that under the objective.

Authors comments: Thanks for the input. We have carefully reconsidered the point you made and have decided to remove the logistic regression from the manuscript. As you pointed out, it doesn’t add much to the study. According to this we have also made some minor changes in manuscript (page 2, line 45-49), (page 12, line 269-271), (page 13, line 295-298), (page 14, line 307-309) and (page 15, line 346).

Sorry for being unclear. We have added information that we are using t-test and chi-square test under methods (page 2, line 40).

Reviewer 4: Under statistical analysis, you mentioned that after performing a t-test with continuous data and chi-square analysis with categorical data, the variables that were statistically significant were included in a multivariate logistic regression model. Why? Also, there certain assumptions that need to be satisfied in other to perform a t-test or any parametric analysis. Were those assumptions satisfied?

Authors comment: We have added information of that the data were approximately normal distributed (page 7, line 167 - 168).

Reviewer 4: Under prehospital characteristics, I suggest you use the significant difference language before elaborating. For example, there were a significant difference in relation to the symptoms altered mental status and shivering when comparing the patients without and with adverse outcomes. Then continue from line 205.

Authors comment: We agree and have made changes in the sentences (page 9, line 205-209).
Reviewer 4: From line 227, you apply the logistic regression. I think you will need to add the predictive objective as part of the overall objective of this paper. Also, you will need to explain what the logistic regression results tells us.

Authors comment: Thanks for the input. We have carefully reconsidered the point you made and have decided to remove the logistic regression from the manuscript. As you pointed out, it doesn’t add much to the study.

Reviewer 4: Finally, can you label your tables to show which one was a t-test and chi-square analysis.

Authors comment: We agree and have label our tables 1, 2 and 3 to better explain when t-test and chi-square were used.

Best regards from the authors.