



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	Mini-Review

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In the line 136 there is an author's comment that can be linked with ethical problems and need to be replaced. An objective description of material's characteristics and the handling practice needed to use it is enough.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the line 39 it seems that author use the terms Yeasts and Fungus as different generous. We suggests that the word fungus be replaced by the term Molds.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>This a very import issue in the field of infection control. This is the first review I've seen regarding handling practices to prevent catheter-related infections. Article will give opportunity to review key aspects of infection control practices associated with catheter-related infections</p> <p>Yes. In the line 136 author describe a research with a specific product using brand name and producing company. This is unnecessary since the major objective of the article is reviewing kinds of materials and devices and the related handling practices needed to use it.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer