## 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**

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The increased risks of death and extra lengths of hospital and ICU stay from hospital-acquired bloodstream infections: a case–control study
AUTHORS	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**

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

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

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

GENERAL COMMENTS	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.