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Reviewer's report:

Authors described in this meta-analysis the short-term and long term outcomes in infective endocarditis patients. The manuscript is well written, however there are some issues that have to be solved:

1. The First-end point of the meta-analysis is to compare short term treatment vs. long term treatment outcomes in patients with IE. However, short term treatment and long-term treatment of IE were not defined in methods.

2. Authors concluded: "A significant increase in mortality was found in IE patients undergoing long-term treatment than short-term treatment". However, the discussion of the manuscript was focused on short term and long term mortality of IE. The conclusion of the study should be explained in the discussion.

3. As secondary end-points, renal, cardiac and thromboembolic complications were analysed. The Definitions of these complications should be explained.

4. Author included in this meta-analysis d retrospective studies with few patients. This fact may cause confusion. I suggest to exclude these small retrospective studies from the meta-analysis.

5. Figures: For each study, there is a graphic that explain the RR and 95% of C.I. However the graphic which summarize the overall RR and 95% of the C.I. was wrong in all figures.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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