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Title: Screening and prophylactic treatment of chronic renal failure patients colonized with *Staphylococcus aureus*: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Reviewer's report

Version: 2 Date: 10 September 2014

Reviewer: Nicola Thomas

Thanks for your contribution reviewing this article with valuable and opportune considerations.

The revisions must include:

1. A revised title to reflect the aims of the review

2. Abstract to include results of screening (not just treatment)

3. A re-run of the literature search including the word 'kidney' and including UK spellings of haemodialysis; colonisation

4. Limitations of the review to be discussed further

Overall an interesting topic but the review aims need to be reflected in the title, abstract and conclusion.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

No, there are discrepancies throughout. The title does not reflect the review question, and the conclusion does not reflect the question. The review question seems to be around route of transmission of S. Aureus; screening for S. aureus; treatment of S.aureus in patients with a CVC on haemodialysis.
**Answer:** Line 1, 2 and 3- The title suggestion was accepted, but central venous catheter was not included because there are two articles that do not mention the use of CVC “Screening and treatment for *Staphylococcus aureus* in patients on hemodialysis: a systematic review and meta-analysis”.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

Quite well described but the descriptors used in the literature search did not include the word 'kidney' or 'chronic kidney disease' and UK spelling of haemodialysis. The CINAHL database was not explored and valuable studies may have been excluded.

**Answer:** Line 129- The CINAHL and PubMed databases had already been surveyed and were inserted in the text (there was no difference in the number of articles included).

Line 131 and 132- The expression 'chronic renal disease' was replaced by 'chronic kidney disease' and 'chronic renal patients' was deleted. Inserted in the text Haemodialysis word that is a synonymous for hemodialysis in the databases, so there was no change in the articles included.

3. Are the data sound?

see point 2

**Answer:** The corrections were accepted as described in item 2.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

The discussion could be presented in a more logical way, in line with the review aims.

**Answer:** All discussion were presented in a more logical way in according with the review aims.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

Some limitations are stated but some limitations such as evaluation of local protocols and patient education interventions are not discussed.

**Answer:** These suggested limitations were included in the text (line 363 to 365)

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Title does not reflect the review's aims. The conclusion does not mention screening, only treatment.

**Answer:** The screening was mentioned in conclusion (line 383 a 386)

9. Is the writing acceptable?

The language used is outdated in parts. Chronic renal failure does not tend to be used now, instead chronic kidney disease. It is not usual to label patients by
their condition, eg. Chronic renal failure patients, rather patients with chronic kidney disease or end-stage kidney disease.

**Answer:** The nomenclatures for chronic kidney disease were changed throughout the text and highlighted in yellow

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Answer:** The statistical was reviewed in the CMA program
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