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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for allowing me to review this paper. This is a well written paper. However, this paper needs some improvement.

Abstract:

In the abstract sometimes abbreviations are used and sometimes not. Please be consistent with this. if you use you an abbreviation, keep using it consistently throughout the abstract, instead of writing out the word in full later on.

Introduction:

Line 31: "Any such ..... trial is needed". Please add some more information in your introduction to support this statement.

Methods section, part "selection of cohort":
Line 7: please state the definition of each of the mentioned codes

Methods section, part "predictors of outcomes":
Line 28: Why was the GCS used instead of an early warning score as a marker of disease severity? Where there no early warning scores that can be used for this purpose?

Methods section, part "definitions":
Line 51: Hypotension is often defined as a systolic blood pressure which remains below 90 mm Hg, despite administering fluids. Was this defintion one that also included the effect of administering fluids?

Methods section, part "interactions":
Line 51-52: On the basis of which data were these medications selected? Please clarify this in the text.
Line 53-55: The word "RSI" at the end of this sentence should be removed
Lines 58-60: How often were the vital signs at either the first on-scene measurement or the last on-scene measurement missing? Please clarify this in your data.

Results section, part "demographic factors":
Line 50: Was the survival corrected for the charlson comorbidty index? This surely will have influenced survival. Please adjust for this in your results.
Limitations section:

This section should be part of your discussion, preferably after naming the strengths of your study.

Discussion section:

Please take a very critical look at this section.

This section misses strengths. Furthermore, you should reflect more on your own results, for example why did some medication have a positive effect whilst others showed no difference. These things are also parts which should be reflected upon in your discussion. Overall much can be improved in this section by reflecting more on your own results, previous studies, adding strengths etc.
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