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To the Editor of *BMC Infectious Diseases*

Amsterdam, March 27th 2014

Re: MS: 1988538098114534

Dear Prof. Pak Leung Ho,

Thank you for considering a revision of our manuscript "Development of quality indicators for antimicrobial treatment in adults with sepsis" for publication in *BMC Infectious Diseases*.

Regarding the Editor’s comments:

1. Methodology. Add the latest Internet link to the SWAB guideline.
   Answer: we added the link in the manuscript, reference number 12, page 5 – lines 140 -141.

2. Reviewer 2 raised some concerns about potential bias in the composition of the panel member. There seems to be overlap in the persons who prepared the SWAB guidelines and arbitrated on the QIs here. Add a Table as a supplementary file to show the persons who participated in the write-up of the SWAB guidelines and who took part in stage 1 (12 members), stage 2 (six members) and stage 3 (13 members).
   Answer: There is indeed overlap in the persons who prepared the SWAB guideline and arbitrated on the QIs. We introduced this overlap intentionally. According to the AGREE criteria (the 'guideline for guidelines'), every clinical practice guideline should include 'easily identifiable key recommendations' and 'key review criteria for monitoring and/or audit purposes'.[1] We asked the preparatory guideline committee to rate all the recommendations as selected by the research group from the guideline to single out the KEY recommendations. These key recommendations were translated into ‘review criteria for monitoring and/or audit purposes’ – i.e. the quality indicators – by the research group during the consensus procedure. All these experts not only had a complete overview of the literature, they also had abundant daily practice, clinical experience. To ensure that at least 12 experts would fill in the questionnaire’s, which increases the reliability of the Delphi method, two experts with clinical expertise in this field were added up to the panel. Developing indicators based on guidelines while using the guideline authors is a method that is often used, see for example references 2 thru 6.[2-6]

The table as requested was added as a supplementary file.

Yours sincerely, on behalf of all authors,

Caroline van den Bosch, M.D.¹
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¹Corresponding author
²Alternate corresponding author
Academic Medical Center, University of Amsterdam
Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases
Room F4-217, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ Amsterdam, the Netherlands
Tel.: +31-20-5664380; Fax: +31-20-6972286
¹Email: c.m.vandenbosch@amc.nl
²Email: s.e.geerlings@amc.nl
Reference List


