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Reviewers report:

The authors tried to describe the predictive value of CRP and PCT for the prediction of sepsis in the oldest old patients. Based on their results they conclude that CRP and PCT are both useful for the prediction of sepsis in oldest old patients. The article is written in clear English and needs no language editing.

Abstract: the result section of the abstract could be shortened. The optimum cut-off values could be deleted in this section.

Introduction: clearly written.

Methods: The inclusion criteria and thus the population could be described in more detail. How long were the patients already in hospital? Was there already a suspicion of infection? Or were all patients admitted to the ICU with a new suspicion of infection? Please provide a more detailed description of the patients.

Results:

- The result section is definitely too well described and should be shortened.

- For example: Table 1 showed no differences between the sepsis and non-sepsis group regarding age and comorbidities. Reason of admission and diagnosis of infection are mentioned in Table 1.
- Table 3 can be excluded > results can be mentioned in the results sections.

- Figure 1, 2 and 3 can be excluded > results can be mentioned in the results sections.

- It would be interesting to provide the NPV of PCT at a cut-off level of 0.25 ng/ml as this cut-off level is nowadays used to exclude infection

Discussion

- Please be aware of repetitive information

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

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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