



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_AIR_8475
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review of the Intraluminal Fluid Pathway to Prevent Catheter Related Bloodstream Infections and Occlusions
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Manuscript 2013_AIR_8475 , titled : A Review of the Intraluminal Fluid Pathway to Prevent Catheter Related Bloodstream Infections and Occlusions figure out several views in preventing CR-BSI regarding intravascular devices. I believe the author(s) have many experiences in dealing with this issue.</p> <p>First of all, the English text of the manuscript should be revised.</p> <p>I suggest some aspect t o consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Give the definition of the CR-BSI, since it related only for Central venous line only, not perifer, it must clearly explained in the beginning. - Typos and spacing must be check thoroughly - The subtitles should clear enough to separate each part, i.e. row number 187: "EDUCATION" was typed by uppercass word, but there were no other subtitles typed by uppercass words. - Content of the subtitles should be in comprehensive manner in order to explain the message of the manuscript. - Subtitle: "Patient IV connector assessment "(rows below no 223) should be more explaining. I suggest build it in positive sentences than questions 	<p>The authors have over 80 combined years in healthcare and almost 20 combined years focusing on the intraluminal fluid pathway.</p> <p>The entire introduction has been rewritten with careful attention to format throughout. I believe that some of the spacing issues occurred with the different computers. We did not submit with these present.</p> <p>The CDC definition focuses on central venous catheters. Currently in the US, the PIV is beginning to garner interest. It is the author's opinion that this area will be researched over the next few years and practice may be changed greatly.</p> <p>The patient assessment section was written from our long and varied experience with bedside care. It is meant as a guidance tool and not a formal tool. Assessment is a critical thinking action that takes place when combining knowledge with the current setting. This is meant to help in the process</p> <p>While we missed the perfection mark on our original submission, we have attempted to</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>sentences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Currently, references list are not written in a consistent style. It should be uniform and according to the journal instruction, i.e. references number 1,2, 32 were in different style.- Provide the table and figure in a proper and informative style. Follow the instruction of the journal.	<p>follow the guidelines closely during the rewriting period. I will apologize in advance for continued shortcomings. I have attempted to follow the instructions</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		