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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript purpose is useful yet there are some flaws that need to be addressed.

1. The introduction is accurate but I suggest the authors tailor each concept toward the need for their screening system. Some grammatical and formatting improvements can be made, including merging the last sentence with the paragraph above to avoid a 1 sentence paragraph.

2. Methods should include more description of the study population, for instance, % Adults vs Peds. % in ICU, other? Refer to STARD criterion for suggestions.

3. Methods. The tool is limited in that only one person ranked all data. There is no kappa scores among raters, since there was only one. I suggest discuss of this bias/limitation in the Discussion section.

4. Consider placing the provisional information for data tables in the supplement, as it is not the final result.

5. Data analysis - why were so many excluded? Describe the large # of exclusions and rationale in more detail. I flow diagram may be helpful.

6. A table or flow diagram to describe actual differences between provision and final scoring system would be useful.
7. Without a software program, web based input or even simply a checklist, the usefulness of this model is limited. I suggest the authors develop an actual tool that is useful for the future as they and others move forward to validate their model.

8. The model text description is difficult to follow.

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.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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