

Reply to the Editor.

Dear Respected Editor/Reviewer

Good day

Thank you very much for the comprehensive review and for your precious time that you spent in reviewing this study. We did the advised changes and answered the queries. All the changes were marked by red colour for easily tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes. We tried to improve the language as we can. Thank you gain for your precious assistance.

Here we are replying point by point:

The reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1:

The work presented in the manuscript "Trends of Central Line-associated Bloodstream Infections in Intensive Care Unit in Kingdom of Bahrain: Four years' Experience" is excellent and can be accepted for publication following through English language check prior to publication.

Our reply:

Thank you very much for your excellent feedback. We did thorough English language checking as requested.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for your comprehensive review.

1. When the authors analyzing the risk factors for CLABSI, the primary clinical diagnosis were explored, which including medical and surgical. However, the type of medical diagnoses will also affect the rates of CLABSI to a large extent. For example, patients with malignant cancer are more inclined to suffer from CLABSI with peripherally inserted central catheters (Lancet. 2013 Jul 27;382(9889):311-25. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60592-9). Thus, we recommend the authors add more data on this aspect and discuss whether related chronic diseases at baseline will infect the results.

Our reply:

As there were no significant differences between the patients who developed CLABSI and those who did not in the rate of underlying medical or surgical aetiologies (as shown in table 2), we did not do further analysis. We also previously mentioned this pint in the limitation section. We coloured in red. However, it is interesting to do further research about the rate of CLABSI in certain diseases. We thank the reviewer for this fruitful idea, and we will put this point as one of the study limitations that needs further studies.

2. In table 1, the authors should give the statistical methods for each P value as footnote, e.g. Chi Square test or Fisher exact test.

Correction was done and coloured in red.

3. How did the authors define medical conditions or surgical conditions?

The needed information was added and coloured in red.

4. In the sentence "...who found that central line insertion duration for more than eight days; was a significant risk factor to develop CLABSI...", the ";" should be deleted.

Correction was done and coloured in red.

Reviewer 3:

The long-term quantitative study fullfills the criteria of a short but clear description of the problem, a wide statistical analysis, description of the results and an appropriate discussion as well as a (short) description of limitations. The only one I would recommend is a very minor language polishing.

Our reply:

Thank you very much for your excellent feedback. We did thorough English language checking as requested.

Editor comments

Thank you very much for your comments.

(5) Self-cited references: There is 1 self-cited reference; The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and

Our reply:

There is no self-citation in this manuscript. Please provide us with suspected reference so that we can elaborate the issue. There is no reference at all for any of the authors participating in this manuscript. May be there some similarities in the name of one the authors which is the reason for this confusion.

Language:

The language was revised again by a native English Speaker so that It is improved to the level suitable to be accepted by your prestigious journal.

The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

WE provided the original figure document in the form of PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

And The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

The “Article Highlights” section was added at the end of the main text.