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Reviewer's report:

The authors have substantially improved their protocol. The overall design and outcome measures are now better described. However, some problems yet remain:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The primary response variable is now defined as "To compare the failure rate of short therapy with Ertapenem and with AS in localized IAI". Please specify the meaning of failure rate here. Is it "failure" + "late failure" (according to definitions given in Data collection) or is it "failure" only? If it is "failure" only, why isn't "late failure" a secondary end-point?

2. The information about the efficacy of AS on that the authors have determined the sample size should be included in the protocol. If this was a retrospective analysis of 300 cases in their department this needs to be mentioned as a source for the estimated failure rate of 30%.

3. The manuscript still needs a thorough linguistic revision. There are numerous syntax errors, inappropriate use of definite article, and past or present tense when future tense should be used.

Minor Essential Revisions

4. The abstract should include information about the primary end-point, therapy in the two treatment arms, and their duration. The trial registration number and the appropriate web site should be included instead of the text "TRIAL REGISTRATION NUMBER".

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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