Reviewer's report

Title: Surgical revascularization versus amputation for peripheral vascular disease in dialysis patients: a cohort study

Version: 1 Date: 2 November 2004

Reviewer: Paul Eggers

Reviewer's report:

General

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

The major concern I have is the length of follow-up in the analyses. 30 days (essentially peri-operative mortality) seems to be a very short period of time on which to judge the relative merits of one procedure versus another. Did you consider using a one year follow-up time?

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

None

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

It seems to this reviewer that "indication bias" is still a potential problem with respect to the large percentage difference in gangrene cases. I would feel better if the authors recommendations reflected more caution on this note.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No