Reviewer's report

Title: Factors affecting the accuracy of the urine dipstick test for the detection of bacteriuria or urinary tract infections. A meta-analysis.

Version: 1 Date: 24 November 2003

Reviewer: Paulo J Nogueira

Reviewer's report:

General
The article is interesting and should be published.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Is this really a meta-analysis a meta-analysis study? What final new results were gathered from all this work?

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Inclusion and exclusion of articles on the study should be clarified.

Methodology of gathering of information, the literary search, though I believe it is referred as what truly happened should written in a way that it does not give the impression that the work was nor done as properly as it should have.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Abstract is very difficult to read. It must be rewritten. What's written under background is not background. The results subsection must be written in a comprehensible manner. Sub-groups are often referred but it is not clear what they are.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No
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