

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**Manuscript NO:** 32548

**Title:** Confirming longline position in neonates - survey of practice in England and Wales

**Reviewer's code:** 02488399

**Reviewer's country:** Serbia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-20

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Authors analyzed use of different methods in confirming long line position in newborns. This is worthy audit of contemporary practice in England and Wales. However, in order to give more precise data, section of Results should be completely re-written and adjusted according to usual standards of scientific paper. Presentation of data in tables, figures or flowcharts would be helpful.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**Manuscript NO:** 32548

**Title:** Confirming longline position in neonates - survey of practice in England and Wales

**Reviewer's code:** 02736604

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-20

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a telephone survey of 170 neonatal units (in England and Wales) to establish practices for confirming the tip position of central venous line after insertion. Although this topic has interest for the reader, this manuscript has some inaccuracies. English is correct. Specific comments follow: Abstract ? Results: they should be rewritten, as authors present their data sometime as absolute number, or sometime as percentage. As a result, they are often difficult to understand. I suggest to report both numbers and percent (in brackets) Main text ? Results: they should be rewritten, as authors present their data sometime as absolute number, or sometime as percentage. A table reporting responses (numbers and percent in brackets) to each question according to the centers' level would be helpful. ? How many units used central venous line with guide wires ? ? Discussion: The relevance of ultrasound for a proper positioning of the tip should be emphasized. In fact, according to some authors ultrasounds are more reliable than the x-ray ? Conclusions, third last line: what "24/7"? References: ? most



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

references at the end of the text are not consistent with the journal guidelines. Please recheck

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

**Manuscript NO:** 32548

**Title:** Confirming longline position in neonates - survey of practice in England and Wales

**Reviewer's code:** 00742196

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-20

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this study, authors conducted a telephone survey of 170 Neonatal Units in England and Wales and found that the Neonatal units they surveyed are overwhelmingly relying on plain radiographs and contrast is only used in a third of units. Contrast has been proposed to be superior to plain radiographs in the confirmation of the line tip position, however, it is not well accepted by the units surveyed. While this information is interesting, it adds very little to the literature or help people to choose method for confirmation of line tip position. If authors go further to analyze the outcome different between the units that use contrast and those that use regular x-ray for the confirmation of line tip, it may help the readers select to use one of the methods proposed.