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Reviewer's report:

Predictive factors of urinary tract infections among the oldest old in the general population. A population based prospective follow-up study.

The aim of this paper was to study the incidence of UTI in very old members of the general population and to identify factors which might predict the development of a UTI.

Abstract

This is clearly written with no conclusion which is not justifiable form the results.

Introduction

This is well argued. The authors make no mention, however of the problem with UTI case ascertainment and the influence of asymptomatic bacteriuria in this population leading to mistaken “diagnosis of UTI” and how this might have an impact on identified associated risk factors.

Materials and method

The methods seem appropriate for the type of study. The case ascertainment of UTI is a pragmatic one and presumably arises from retrospective analysis of clinician records? This should be specified.

Did participants give consent for this study specifically or for the whole project? If the latter, did participants consent to the use of their data for such additional analyses?

There was no mention of catheterization as being a risk factor for both bacteriuria and UTI – was this not included, particularly as the population contained institutionalized older people some of whom might be expected to have a long term catheter in situ. Were there any data about pad use in those with self reported incontinence of urine as this too has been shown to result in an excess risk of UTI / bacteriuria

Data analyses

The word denominator should replace denumerator, I think. Otherwise the analysis appears appropriate.

Results
Presented well and diagrams appropriate. What was the data quality regarding the diagnosis of UTI like? Apart from documentation of “UTI” what other quality checks were in place to confirm this diagnosis?

Discussion
There is some editorial work to be done on the English for readability here but the discussion is apt, well referenced and there are no extrapolations beyond the relevance of the results.

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

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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