Reviewer’s report

Title: Hyperbaric oxygen therapy for primary sternal osteomyelitis.

Version: 2 Date: 11 February 2013

Reviewer: Sandro Rizoli

Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Presentations, diagnoses and/or management of new and emerging diseases

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This is a good report. Unfortunately the authors failed to address the single question I posed: what is the evidence supporting their conclusion that HOT was of any therapeutic value? I suggest the authors either present the evidence supporting their conclusion or simply recognize that it is not possible to be sure whether HOT was beneficial and argue that the fast time to healing (indirect and certainly not conclusive evidence) suggests that HOT was beneficial.
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