

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 65049

Title: Emergency service results of central venous catheters: Single center, 1042 patients, 10-year experience

Reviewer's code: 05077783

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-26

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-28 15:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-04 13:18

Review time: 3 Days and 21 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgooffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present a study on the complications of central venous catheters that is of scientific interest, with analysis of a large sample of patients. It would be interesting to have further information on some aspects of the study: was ultrasound guidance used for catheter insertion? If so, what was the impact on the occurrence of complications? What were the criteria used when choosing the site of catheter insertion for each patient? Table 2, which present the most important results regarding complications, could be improved by presenting the percentages regarding each site of insertion instead of the total number of patients. In the abstract conclusion, the authors suggest a preference for catheterization of the subclavian vein, while in the conclusion of the manuscript, internal jugular vein is suggested as being the safest site of puncture. Writing in the English language also needs reviewing, so the results of this very interesting study can be presented in a clear manner.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Critical Care Medicine

Manuscript NO: 65049

Title: Emergency service results of central venous catheters: Single center, 1042 patients, 10-year experience

Reviewer's code: 05077783

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Brazil

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-26

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-30 10:49

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-03 01:08

Review time: 2 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have made significant improvements in the manuscript. In the abstract conclusion, it is stated that jugular vein catheters have lower infection rates than the others. In the results section, however, the rate of infection in subclavian vein catheters was lower than in jugular insertion.