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Reviewer's report:

Dr Shi and colleagues have submitted a DUE of cefepime in a large hospital where they demonstrate a positive impact of an intervention for improving cefepime prescribing. Whilst the concept is good, I do not feel that the paper has been described in the correct level of detail and grammatically, there are numerous issues. Some specific comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Abstract - the Methods does not describe the education intervention in any level of detail which is inappropriate given the importance of this to the paper.
2. Abstract - the results section could have some specific data included
3. Introduction - why introduce DUR when the authors mean DUE?
4. Bacterial names should be italicised
5. The last two paragraphs of the introduction are a mixture of methods and results and do not belong here
6. Please state how the authors handled multiple cefepime courses for the same patient
7. Results - please state more statistical findings, even if non significant so the reader can assess whether any trends were present. This is also the case for Tables 1-3 where I think statistical analyses should be included for each item
8. Figure 1 - shouldn't this be a cycle where after completing the DUE, you re-evaluate and then re-intervene if necessary?

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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