Reviewer's report

Title: Procalcitonin and C-reaction protein in urinary infection position diagnosis

Version: 2 Date: 16 December 2013

Reviewer: Carlos Estrada

Reviewer's report:

Major Revisions:
1) Cohort - a patient number of 46 is a very small sample size. Is there a power calculation to determine statistical significance of the authors' work?
2) Cohort characterization - the authors need to clarify several points regarding their study population: a) how were urine samples collected? b) how were temperatures taken - axillary or rectal? c) were patients also evaluated by US? VCUG? Do we know the hydrenephrosis or vesicoureteral reflux of these patients? These are critically important data that if not available or recorded properly would significantly weaken the authors' work.
3) What do the authors base their classification of renal injury (<25%, 25-50%, >50%) on? Is this a published classification scheme?
4) Statistical analysis - I do not understand the "cut points" in the authors' data - what do normal v. basically normal mean? This needs to be clarified and cited appropriately.

Minor Essential Revisions
There are many minor grammatical errors that should be addressed by the editors.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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