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Dear Editor-in-Chief,

We are pleased to submit our revised manuscript “Appropriate Initial Antibiotic Therapy in Hospitalized Patients with Gram-Negative Infections: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis” for your consideration. We have addressed editorial comment and incorporated editorial suggestion. This cover letter includes response to editorial comment and formatting of the manuscript conforming to the journal style. This manuscript represents an evidence review of contemporary literature that we performed at the Tufts Center for Clinical Evidence Synthesis. All authors have read and approved the submission of the manuscript. The manuscript has not been published elsewhere, and it is not currently under consideration for publication by another journal.

We appreciate your consideration of this submission to BMC Infectious Diseases. Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Gowri Raman, MD, MS
Scientific Staff and Assistant Professor
Tufts Clinical Evidence Synthesis Center
Institute for Clinical Research and Health Policy Studies
Tufts Medical Center
800 Washington St, #63
Boston, MA 02111
Email: graham@tuftsmedicalcenter.org
Phone: 617-636-5109
Fax: 617-636-5560
Editor's report and response
Title: Appropriate Initial Antibiotic Therapy in Hospitalized Patients with Gram-Negative Infections: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
Version: 3 Date: 25 June 2015

Editor's advice

I am satisfied that the authors have addressed the reviewers comments. I only have one comment: could the authors add a justification in the discussion as to why AAT and IAT were examined separately? I would have assumed that the proportion receiving AAT was 1 minus the proportion receiving IAT, but the odds ratios do not add up (1/.38 is not 2.66). If they are indeed the same patients and outcomes, then a line in the methods saying that %IAT+%AAT=100% would be sufficient.

Thank you. We have clarified this in the method (192-194) and discussion section (line 346-348). Although the proportion of unadjusted data for both AAT and IAT add up to 100%, we present them separately for ease of comparison. Because of rounding of decimals to two digits, the odds ratios do not add up.