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Reviewer's report:

This is a comprehensive and well written report looking at interventions for preventing diarrhoea associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. The authors have used a broad search strategy but have found limited information assessing each of the many potential interventions.

1. The authors have largely followed the PRISMA guidelines for this type of review. Although they state the quality of the RCTs was assessed, the methods and results of this were not clear, particularly with respect to risk of bias. (Minor essential revision).

2. There is some repetition in areas, eg in the background section the incidence of HUS is presented in the first paragraph and again in the second last paragraph. There also seems to be some repetition in the sections on food handling - perhaps this could be condensed a little more.

3. In the PRISMA diagram (figure 1) the number of excluded human trials plus the number of assessed trials does not equal the number of screened trials.

4. On page 8 "there was insufficient evidence to support the effectiveness of bacteriophages and other food additives" - such as?

5. page8 - "A 10 year review also reported on probiotics" - and said what?

6. page 23 - I would like to have seen more specific details about the public health response on the management and treatment of acute bloody diarrhoea in children.

7. Table 1 - Farm practices. I found the intervention for the first RCT (ref 118) difficult to follow. Could you please clarify this paragraph?

8. There were a couple of very minor spelling/typing errors
   - P7 - 6 lines from the bottom there is a bracket missing around the p value
   - p15 - line 2 soap
   - p 28 - the first line of the discussion doesn't read correctly
   - p29 - Second paragraph - should probably read "isolation of symptomatic children and adults"
   - p35 - table 1 - vit D - typo in the intervention paragraph.
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