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Dear Editor,

I am sending the manuscript entitled “Efficacy of antibiotic therapy for peritoneal dialysis-associated peritonitis: a meta-analysis of case series studies”, in its revised form, including all changes in the main text, figures, legends and table. These changes were highlighted in red. Also, corrections in the appendix were made.

The point-by-point responses to reviewer’s questions and concerns are the follow:

Sincerely,

Pasqual Barretti

Reviewer: Beth Piraino

I’d like to thank you for the time spent and yours important comments and suggestions to our paper. They for sure will make it clearer and easier to understand.

Major compulsory revisions:

1) This is a nice analysis of case reports of outcomes of various antibiotic protocols to treat peritonitis. However, I found it quite difficult to follow the figures with the current labeling. I think it essential to make the labeling clearer for the reader. In figure one since the only 3rd generation the authors are examining is ceftazidime, I suggest replacing the title of 'third generation cephalosporin and glycopeptide' with 'ceftazidime and glycopeptide. The same is true of the 2nd figure.

We have replaced the labels of figures 1 and 2 to ceftazidime and glycopeptide. Also, the legends were changed according to new labels. In addition the expression ‘third generation cephalosporin’ was replaced by ceftazidime throughout the text (in red).

2) For the last 3 figures, instead of just giving the author on the left hand of the figure, please add the drug begin tested (cipro, cipro, vanco + cipro) etc. This will make it much easier to follow.

In the figures 4 to 6 the name of antibiotics were added (in parenthesis) after the authors’name. Also ‘et al’ was added to the authors when necessary.

Minor essential revisions.

1) I could not find the appendix. Was this uploaded?
Sorry, I think we forgot to upload the appendix. In this version it is placed after the reference list. Changes were made in appendix (in red)

2) **Discretionary revisions** I am not sure it is necessary in Table 1 to list all the countries from which the case series come from. On the other hand some where you should indicate those studies which are in children.

I totally agree; the countries were excluded from the table. On the other hand we included in the table 1 a line specifying the children series (in red). In reality we had three cases series of children which were eligible for inclusion, but only one met all inclusion criteria and was included in the meta-analysis.

3) **There is a typo under. Statistical analysis as cefalothin is misspelled. In the discussion Warady is misspelled.**

We corrected both the typo under (in red)

**Additional changes**

We observed a mistake regarding the inclusion of reference 18 in ‘Comparisons for episodes due to Gram-negative rods’ (Results, page 9, line 17). According to our reanalysis this study only could be used for **Comparisons for initial treatment or culture negative episodes.** As a consequence the results were changed (page 9, lines 17-26), assuming new values, Also, figures 5 and 6 and corresponding legends were changed.

**Reviewer: Liffert Vogt**

The paper of Baretti et al. systematically reviewed all published case series on PD-associated peritonitis and antibiotic treatment. The paper is well written. The main weakness of this analysis consists of inclusion of case-series only introducing significant bias. Yet, no other evidence is present and the limits of the present study are well discussed. Therefore, the results contain useful information in the field of peritoneal dialysis.

**Minor revisions**
1) What is the explanation for lower resolution rates for aminoglycoside-based regimens? Please add to the discussion.

I’d like to thank you for the time spent and yours nice comments and excellent suggestion to our paper. We have added a comment in the Discussion (in red, page 6 lines 5-13 about resolution rate of peritonitis treated by aminoglycoside.

Additional changes

We observed a mistake regarding the inclusion of reference 18 in ‘Comparisons for episodes due to Gram-negative rods’ (Results, page 9, line 17). According to our reanalysis this study only could be used for Comparisons for initial treatment or culture negative episodes. As a consequence the results were changed (page 9, lines 17-26), assuming new values, Also, figures 5 and 6 and corresponding legends were changed.

Editor's Comments:

1) -Please adhere to MOOSE guidelines
Observational Studies http://www.consort-statement.org/resources/downloads/other-instruments/

Thank you for your important suggestions. We found PRISMA guideline and we reported it according to it as this fits better in the scope of our systematic review of interventional studies

2) -Please include an acknowledgement section at the end of the manuscript before the reference list. Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the study by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include the source(s) of funding for all authors. Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements.
According to your suggestion, we have included an acknowledgement section. In this section, we reported that this study was partially supported by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) which provided a educational grant to JVD. Also, we stated an acknowledgement for Marluci Betini, a librarian who helped us in acquisition of data.

3) -Please place your tables in the main manuscript file after the figure legends and references. You should remove the copy from the additional files / figure files.

The table 1 was placed after the figure legends and removed from the additional files.

We observed a mistake regarding the inclusion of reference 18 in ‘Comparisons for episodes due to Gram-negative rods’ (Results, page 9, line 17). According to our reanalysis this study only could be used for Comparisons for initial treatment or culture negative episodes. As a consequence the results were changed (page 9, lines 17-26), assuming new values, Also, figures 5 and 6 and corresponding legends were changed.