

Na Ma, Company Editor-In-Chief  
Editorial Office,  
Baishideng Publishing Group Inc  
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

July 16, 2020

Dear Dr. Na Ma:

We are submitting a revision of the manuscript entitled “Upper Body Peripherally Inserted Central Catheter in Pediatric Single Ventricle Patients” for possible publication as an original article in *World Journal of cardiology*. We have provided our detailed response letter to the reviewer’s comments below.

This manuscript is new and is not being considered elsewhere. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at each participating institution. The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Thank you for your consideration of the manuscript. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any further questions or needs.

Very truly yours,  
Santosh Kaipa, MD, MS

Department of Pediatrics, Division of Critical Care Medicine  
Indiana University School of Medicine  
Riley Hospital for Children at Indiana University Health  
705 Riley Hospital Drive, Phase 2, Rm 4911A  
Indianapolis, IN 46202

Dear Respected Editor and Reviewer:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our paper. We appreciate the reviewer's commitment to helping us improve our work. We have addressed all of the reviewer's insightful comments and, as a result, have provided revision and clarification of some of our most important findings. Our itemized responses to the reviewers' comments are provided below. All changes to the manuscript and tables have been made as track changes – red or violet font.

### **Reviewer 1 Observations:**

1. Introduction: This is a retrospective study, no hypothesis. 2. Statistical analysis: chi square test should be used to compare the complications of PICC and CVCs. 3. The statistical chart needs to be revised, the results need to be clearly described. 4. Grammatical errors need to be corrected. 5. The format of references should conform to the guidelines of the journal. Format is considered as a measure of how carefully work is done.

**Concern 1:** This is a retrospective study, no hypothesis

**Response:** We have made the changes in the Introduction section regarding hypothesis. See Page 6.

**Concern 2.** Statistical analysis: chi square test should be used to compare the complications of PICC and CVCs. We found that the incidence of thrombosis was significantly lower in the groups of patients with PICCs ( $p < 0.04$ )

**Response:** Thanks for the suggestion. We have done the Chi square test comparing the complications between PICC and CVCs and found that the incidence of thrombosis was significantly lower in the groups of patients with PICCs ( $p < 0.04$ ). we have revised the results section and stated this. See page 9(Statistical analysis section) and page 10 (Results section).

**Concern 3:** The statistical chart needs to be revised; the results need to be clearly described.

**Response:** We have revised the Table 1 and created the figures in the Powerpoint as per your suggestion. We have also made some additional changes to the results section to make it more clear. See changes.

**Concern 4:** Grammatical errors need to be corrected.

**Response:** We apologize for the errors. We have made changes rectifying the grammatical errors. The changes are highlighted in red and violet colors.

**Concern: 5.** The format of references should conform to the guidelines of the journal. Format is considered as a measure of how carefully work is done.

**Response:** We apologize for the discrepancy in the format of references. We have now revised the format of the references to conform with the guidelines of the journal.

”  
.

We look forward to further comments from the reviewers or editor in response to these revisions. We will be happy to address any additional concerns.

Sincerely,

Santosh Kaipa, MD, MS