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Reviewer's report:

"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: THE MANUSCRIPT READS BETTER AND IS MORE SCIENTIFICALLY CORRECT-- WELL DONE AUTHORS! BUT THERE ARE STILL SEVERAL POINTS THAT WOULD BENEFIT BY CHANGING- SEE BELOW.

1. Make your conclusions in the abstract stronger by saying that AIMS65 is a much easier, readily calculated scoring system compared to the others maybe by ending the conclusions with", but the AIMS65 scoring system is much easier and readily calculated that the other scoring systems"

2. Add the statistical comparison of the AIMS65 to the other scoring systems in the legend to figure 2

3. Table 4 what are the p values comparing. Best to add a footnote describing this

3. Page 5 line 11 I personally would change the term "spurting" to "actively bleeding"

4. I really think that you should address the limitation of total patient number in the limitations section of the discussion one sentence only

5. Page 12 lines 33- 39 you need to reword this to" Our study strongly suggests that the AIMS65 scoring system is better than the GBS system for predicting mortality (p=0.07) ". This way the reader can determine if they think it is superior ( remember your numbers are not great enough to really answer the question statistically and the p value is NOT truly statistically significant. Be upfront and word it as "strongly suggests" rather than claiming it IS superior."

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.

Yes

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
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