Reviewer's report

**Title:** Perception and management of fever in infants up to six months of age: A survey of US pediatricians

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 6 September 2010

**Reviewer:** Michael T Crocetti

**Reviewer's report:**

The topic of fever management in children 0-6 months is an important issue for primary care and ED pediatric providers. Management of fever is further influenced by our successful vaccination efforts against Hib, pneumococcus, and possible meningococcus. I applaud you on analyzing such a large study population although as you state in the paper it may not be a true national representation. Why limit the study population to 400? I think that the most important message in the manuscript is how fever is treated differently after vaccinations. Has this been studied before? Management of fever in young children vs older has been extensively studied. Is the new thing here management of fever after vaccination?

Abstract - The abstract should have a specific objective statement unless this is specific journal requirements.

Background - 3rd paragraph, 4th sentence should start with beliefs. The last sentence in the 3rd paragraph is awkward to me. What does predicted mean? The background needs more. What has been done before regarding pediatric perceptions and what does this study add? I wonder if the last sentence should be in the discussion section.

Methods - How was the random sample drawn - computer generated, random number table?

Why 400? GEE makes sense here. Do you have to do any other adjustments to the analysis because it was a national survey? Otherwise this section is well written.

Results - Be careful not to re-state data that is in the tables. The results section should just state findings without interpretation. In the section "Predictors of recommendation for fever management" the second sentence is a summary statement and should be in the discussion. It is very interesting that respondents in group practice were less likely to recommend hospital admission or ER. Why do you think that is? In the section on influence of practicing guidelines I wonder if there are differences between those who state they follow guidelines vs. those who do not. This would be very interesting. Is the sample too small - about 40 stating they don't use guidelines?

Discussion - for the most part this is well written. What is groundbreaking about
your findings? Is it the management of fever after vaccinations? If so this should be the emphasis of the paper.

Conclusion - The last sentence - What do you mean by these results may be valuable when estimating burden of managing fever? Its a strong statement that needs more clarification.

Table 2 - At the bottom of table you should state what's included in the multivariable model.
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