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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The question addressed in the background section of the article “to evaluate the efficacy of bedside point prevalence studies to assess compliance with recommendations” does not match with the title of the article. I think the question must be reconsidered to “effectiveness of a training program on compliance with recommendations for VL care”. The point prevalence studies are only the instrument to measure the compliance but not the intervention itself.

The authors do not give information about their recommendations for VL care within the training program and on which bases they developed their recommendations. They only give the criteria they surveyed in the prevalence studies. Furthermore the authors state that “a line was considered adequate if all the following criteria were fulfilled” but results for this “overall” compliance are not given.

As an example: The reader of this article does not get information if the use of split-septum connectors was recommended in the campaign but in table 4 it is given as a parameter indicating good infection control.

Another discussion might be for example if the registration of set replacement is an indicator for good infection control. This might have been a recommendation within the training program but registration as such does not necessarily improve the quality of care. As the authors do not give information about their recommended changing frequency for administration sets nor if the registration was part of the recommendation it remains unclear if the compliance with the changing frequency or just with registering was improved.

Minor essential revisions

In table 2 in line “location of peripheral lines” the numbers of % are missing for study 2.

Discretionary revisions

Table 2 might be left out as these data do not add information to the study question unless e.g. the insertion site for CVL was part of the training program.

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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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