



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This article addresses two important preventable complications of intravenous lines - infection and occlusion, focussing on the role of intravenous connectors and nursing care. Fifty three articles are included in the references. Although the article covers a number of important issues, there are several suggested amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The target audience is unclear. This would appear to be an article aimed primarily at nurses – a whole lot of the issues covered in the article relate to nursing care of IV lines, lack of knowledge of nurses and in service nursing education. It may be useful to clearly state that this review relates to nursing issues with IV lines.2. There is no aim. At the end of the background section it would be useful to have a sentence or two stating the purpose or aim of the review.3. There is no explanation of material and methods.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>This paper is described as a “mini- review” . What is this – a summary of a systematic review? Is it defined by length or number of references? It is essential to have a paragraph explaining the methodology and materials used – which journals were included and why? Were any excluded?</p> <p>4. The section on reflux with different connectors lines 171 to 186 should follow on the initial discussion lines 83-90 to avoid repetition.</p> <p>5. Line 223 Patient IV connector assessment – appears to be a tool developed by the authors to improve care of IV lines. Is this so? Has it been used and validated?</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>There are numerous places where two words have run into one another with the formation of the pdf e.g . Line 40 for the line 42 duration the line 88 with neutral connectors</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer