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Reviewer's report:

Stocker et al present a novel, low cost intervention to improve antibiotic prescribing in their pediatric ICU. It is particularly interesting as it presents a stewardship intervention in a specialized pediatric population.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Section of the methods and results should be reorganized. The section "A checklist as a simple achievable intervention" should be in the methods section. While it is understand that this checklist was developed after the results of baseline period were analyzed, nonetheless it would be clearer if it were placed in the methods. The authors (in the method) could state that the intervention was developed between the study periods.

2. Subheaders may also help the results section: the authors could state 1) Results of Baseline phase 2) Results of Intervention period.

3. The authors should state which individuals in their ICU are actually prescribe antibiotics (residents, fellows, shift working physicians) and the numbers of each in each period (if different). This is so the readers understands how many unique individuals participated in the intervention. Is the intervention period later in the academic year (later in the training year of residents, interns, etc) as this may affect practice.

4. The authors should describe what other stewardship interventions were in place, if any in their hospital (education, prior authorization, etc).

In the first full paragraph on page 10, the authors discuss the report by Buising et al, that the implementation of a computerised decision support system was associated with a greater improvement than with academic detailing. Buising et al computerized decision support appears to be very different from the intervention that the authors created for their study, so the comparison is unclear--the authors should clarify or delete that sentence.
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