

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67767

Title: A bundle for peripherally inserted central catheter placement in neonates with

persistent left superior vena cava: Eight case reports

**Reviewer's code:** 05117991

**Position:** Associate Editor

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor, Director, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-13 10:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-16 19:57

**Review time:** 3 Days and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No



## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, I would like to thank you all for this case series on an important subject- I will ask for several revisions, which I believe will strengthen the manuscript. 1- Instead of using the word bundle please use "acronym" Acronym: an abbreviation formed from the initial letters of other words and pronounced as a word- 2- The article can be more educative is the indications of PICC placement in neonates in general can be addressed at the introduction part. 3-At the history of present illness subtitle, a step-wise unnecessarily detailed explanation of a PICC tail placement procedure was given. This is not required as the procedure is not novel nor relevant to the sub-title. 4-Do the authors at least have a one-year follow-up? How is the clinical outcome in this patient group?# 5- Do the PICC placement team, which, from my understanding consist of nurses receive additional training for this procedure? If so, the details of this training should be presented to the reader. Because this is a highly invasive procedure in my country only medical doctors are allowed to place central catheters. 6- The authors state "In the future, PICC placement should be performed under the guidance of that B-ultrasound if B-ultrasound or chest X ray is not performed before PICC procedure." Are the authors now practicing PICC placement in their institution as per their recommendation. did they change their practice by the help the conclusions they made from this study. 7- The types of PLSVC has been introduced at the discussion section. That is not the right place, the classification should be introduced at the introduction or Materials and Methods section. 8- What is unextubated? at the discussion section under the subtitle "the influence of PICCs in different types of PLSVC ub the clinic" subtitle authors use "unextubated". when the tip is in correct position.. This word doesn't match the rest of the sentence, I cannot understand the message of this sentence. Please clarify. 9-At the conclusion, T is for time, but should be clarified as - A PICC placement



should be delayed at least 24 hours after birth in elective clinical settings. 10- Overall the manuscript is well written. But more details on the cases and shortened discussion are essential.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67767

Title: A bundle for peripherally inserted central catheter placement in neonates with

persistent left superior vena cava: Eight case reports

Reviewer's code: 05532383

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MPhil

Professional title: Academic Research, Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bangladesh

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-12 19:06

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-18 18:01

Review time: 5 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</li> <li>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection</li> </ul>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, I would like to thank you for this study. Please go through the file attached and correct as per the comments. It would be good if you make another section under discussion as challenges of this approach.