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Reviewer's report:

General
A useful piece of work that illustrates the safety and effectiveness of SC infusion for the purpose of rehydration when compared to IV administration. I understand that there may be size concerns, however I am still unhappy that major outcome data such as fluid volumes administered are not reported even when they are not determined to be significant. It is useful data for the reader. Also, where results are significant and means or ratios are reported, relative risks and confidence intervals would be helpful as well (they provide more information than a simple p value. For example on page 9 in paragraph 3 the results of agitation due to the route of administration could be reported as 11/30 (37%) vs 24/30 (80%), RR = 0.5 95% CI (0.3,0.8). This indicates that patients were half as likely to become agitated with the SC device inserted than the IV device. Otherwise well done!

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Eliminate sentence on page 7 paragraph 3 "Means and standard deviations not presented making interpretation difficult". If the data was non-parametric then medians and inter-quartile ranges should be reported, not means and SD.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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