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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks for the consideration of my comments.

I am happy for this manuscript to be accepted as is, although I would recommend that a piece is added to the results around:

"Based on the reviewer's perceptive observation that a number of individuals prone to risk in the CVC group may be leading to an exaggeration of risk, we conducted a sensitivity analysis by excluding patients with more than 1 and more than 2 recorded CRBSI's. The following figure illustrates the frequency of infections among CVC patients in the study. No variables were found to be statistically significant when excluding patients' with more than 1 case of CBRSI (n=10). However, excluding patients with more than two cases (n=2) yielded similar results to that of the primary analysis as illustrated in the subsequent table. The median duration between CRBSI's among these patients was 117 days with a min of 50 days and a maximum of 465 days between events. We would argue that there are few hyper offenders (more than 2 cases of CBRSI's) in this study and that omission of these patients does not alter the primary findings of this study."

At present this work is only in the reply to authors, but is interesting enough that it can be added to the manuscript, either written as a directional statement qualified by "(Results not shown)", or as a formal sensitivity analysis with a supplementary online-only regression table. Honestly, this aspect of the analysis differentiates this project from others, and clarifies the certainty of evidence in the area.

All that said, congratulations and this suggestion is discretionary.
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As a minimum standard, please include a few sentences that outline what you think are the authors’ hypothesis/objectives, their main results, and the conclusions drawn. Your report should constructively instruct authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable for publication, or provide detailed reasons as to why the manuscript does not fulfill our criteria for consideration. Please supply appropriate evidence using examples from the manuscript to substantiate your comments. Please break your comments into two bulleted or numbered sections: major and minor comments.
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**Are the methods appropriate and well described to allow independent reproduction of experiments?**

Please state in the ‘Comments to Authors’ box below what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods (study design, data collection, and data analysis), and what is required, if anything, to improve the quality of reporting
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**

If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.
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**Are you able to assess the statistics?**

- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?

- Is the exact sample size (n) reported for each experimental group/condition (as a number, not a range)?

- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?

- Are all error bars defined in the corresponding figure legends?

- Has a sample size calculation been included, or a description and rationale about how sample sizes were chosen?
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