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Reviewer's report:

My recommendation is Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

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.

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.

3. Are the data sound?
   see point 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
5. 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.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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

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The language used is outdated in parts.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.
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