

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	The increased risks of death and extra lengths of hospital and ICU stay from hospital-acquired bloodstream infections: a case-control study
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Barnett, Adrian; Page, Katie; Campbell, Megan; Martin, Elizabeth; Rashleigh-Rolls, Rebecca; Halton, Kate; Paterson, David; Hall, Lisa; Jimmieson, Nerina; White, Katherine; Graves, Nicholas

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Prof. Mark Cotton Head, Division Paediatric Infectious Diseases Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences Stellenbosch University
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	02-Sep-2013

<b>THE STUDY</b>	Unsure of stats - needs more qualified opinion
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	Discussion too short and conclusion too long; requires attention Organisms should be mentioned in abstract

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Graham Dunn University of Manchester, UK  No competing interests
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	19-Sep-2013

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	This is a nicely written paper and, going through your referees' check-lists I'm happy that all of the key quality criteria are fulfilled. I recommend publication as it stands. I have no criticisms for the authors or any suggestions for changes.
-------------------------	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: Prof. Mark Cotton  
Head, Division Paediatric Infectious Diseases  
Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences  
Stellenbosch University  
Tygerberg  
South Africa

Discussion too short and conclusion too long; requires attention  
Organisms should be mentioned in abstract

Response: We have cut some sentences from the conclusion. We have mentioned some of the

common organisms in the abstract.

Reviewer: Graham Dunn  
University of Manchester, UK

This is a nicely written paper and, going through your referees' check-lists I'm happy that all of the key quality criteria are fulfilled. I recommend publication as it stands. I have no criticisms for the authors or any suggestions for changes.

Response: Thanks for your time.