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Reviewer's report:

General

In the present work, comparison of outcomes (adverse drug events, breakthrough fungal infection, costs etc.) associated with the two regimens in the antifungal prophylaxis algorithm for neutropenic haematology/oncology patients is done.

The problem seems to be interesting. I have few comments on the improper orientation of the paper. It is presented in a way that it becomes incomprehensive and confusing and unnecessarily lengthy.

1. The tables are cumbersome. Actually, the results section covers most of the material presented in the Tables. So, the Tables can be shortened and made more precise.

2. A reference is made for using logistic regression model. But it is not clear, where is this being used. Most of the comparisons between two groups are univariate. If the logistic regression is being used, then the detail of the model (outcome variable, covariates etc.) should be given. Also in that case, the comparison between the “unadjusted” and “adjusted” treatment effect should be made. Only then the real need of the logistic regression model would be justified.

3. In the first para (p.13), again the reference for “using mixed or random effect logistic regression” is made. This is being refered for patients who received multiple courses of antifungals. But, it is not clear how are two types of models being used? In this context, it will be better to do subgroup analysis for patients receiving multiple courses of antifungals vs patients receiving single course of antifungals.

The paper can be considered for publication after the above major revisions have been incorporated in the manuscript.
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