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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a good paper highlighting the importance of good antimicrobial prophylaxis for appendectomy. This paper also shows the diversity of antimicrobial regimes that occur when no Guidelines are available. The methods used and statistics are very good. The cohort is very large, ei 2139 patients, compared to 45 studies with 9576 patients in the Cochrane review.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

From the paper there are no National guidelines, however, it should be stated if hospitals had their own internal prophylaxis guidelines.

On page 8 the use of antibiotic prophylaxis the authors write that 38.8% received a single dosing, 54.2% received dosing for 1 day and 38%. While I understand the numbers after looking in the table the wording sounds like single dose versus one day dosing versus > one day dosing and should be corrected.

I feel that the tables are too similar. For example duration of antibiotic prophylaxis is analyzed in all 3 tables, time of first antibiotic in Tables 2 and 3 and it is unclear why the risk factors included for statistical analysis for table 1 and 3 are different. It seems like most of the table data could be put in a single Table.

On page 12 there is a discussion of the use of antibiotic prophylaxis. I do not believe that there is a consensus on appropriate length of prophylaxis for appendicitis (Mandell 2005). So what is the inappropriate length of prophylaxis definition used for this study?

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

The tables in the text are with numbers while in the Tables they use roman numbers

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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