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Reviewer's report:

The authors report the results of an interesting survey on neonatal infections held during a workshop on “Infection prevention and control in the NICU” with the aim to explore the views of healthcare providers in provincial hospitals in south and central Vietnam on how to improve neonatal infection prevention and control. They documented that some interventions like screening for maternal GBS, limitation of invasive procedures, exclusive breastfeeding are poorly taken into account in these areas, underlying that the results of the survey will be used to adopt appropriate measures for improving infection prevention in Vietnam. I found this manuscript interesting enough to be published, however the following suggested explanation should be presented.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) The title and purpose concern neonatal infections, the authors should better specified the sample taken into account because in methods section the title of the workshop is “infection prevention and control in the NICU” but in results section the authors report that the majority of participants worked in the pediatric ward n=32 or the neonatal ward n =12. The authors should specify if paediatric wards admit newborns and neonates and describe the organization of pediatric hospitals in Vietnam.

Background section

2) The term infections include sistemic and localized infections? The authors should specify.

3) n the work is not been made a distinction between NICU and nursery.

4) The authors should stress much more the importance of low cost of hand washing and exclusive breastfeeding in such low resources settings.

Methods section

5) Were asked the participents to complete a written questionnaire after they attended the workshop to verify the learning of what was discussed during the workshop?

Discretionary Revisions

Discussion section

6) Line 2-3 “the results of the survey could be used to reinforce the importance of antenatal universal screening for GBS in the future hospital strategies”. The
authors should support this phrase with some literature paper like this: Consequences of Prophylaxis for Group B Streptococcal Infections of the Neonate. Baltimore R.S. Semin Perinatol 2007. 31:33-38.

7) The phrase: “one third start with a single antibiotic, half start with two antibiotics….These data suggest a need for guidelines…” should be supported by literature like this: Antibiotic Use and Misuse in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. Empirical treatment of neonatal sepsis: are the current guidelines adequate? Muller-Pebody B, Johnson AP, Heath PT, Gilbert RE, Henderson KL, Sharland M. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal 2011;96:F4–F8.

Discussion section

8) The authors should investigate the problems related to the diagnosis of infections since in results section is reported: “…clinical evaluation was considered as the most appropriate method to diagnose a neonatal infection by the majority of partecipants.”

9) The costs problems did not adequately discussed in the work, although in discussion section the authors underline the need for continued research on cost effectiveness of key interventions in setting with limited resources.

Minor Essential Revisions

Backgrond section

10) The aim of this study was to explore the views should be replaced by the aim of our study was....