November 3, 2015

**Response to Reviewers**

 **Manuscript ID: JHM-15-0379: *"The Michigan Appropriateness Guide for Intravenous catheters (MAGIC) initiative: A summary and review of PICC and venous catheter appropriate use." (JHM-15-0379) to the Journal of Hospital Medicine "***

Copied below is the text sent to the Authors by Reviewer #1 and Reviewer #2. We have enumerated each issue raised by each reviewer and responded to their questions sequentially referencing in our response and where they are reflected in the manuscript text (highlighted).

1. **Reviewer #1: *The title is too long, redundant, and confusing. It should be simplified. For example: “The Michigan Appropriateness Guide for Intravenous catheters (MAGIC) initiative: The role of peripherally inserted central catheters”.***

**Authors Response:**

We are grateful for this suggestion and we have modified the title to read: *“The Michigan Appropriateness Guide for Intravenous catheters (MAGIC) initiative: A summary and review of PICC and venous catheter appropriate use*”.

1. **Reviewer #1: *I agree with the reviewer comment regarding the abstract which could be substantially shortened. For the purposes of this manuscript, eliminating sentences 5 (“This panel applied…..”)-7 (“With each scenario….”) would streamline the abstract. The specifics of the process are appropriately conveyed in the background discussion.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for the insightful comment and we have modified the abstract as suggested.

1. **Reviewer #1: *The statement that “Simple awareness of medical devices in place is central to optimizing care” (page 4) seems logical but the citation to a study of urinary catheters seems odd in a manuscript discussing PICCs. Reconsider.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for the insightful comment and we have removed this reference. We now rely on the VAD-associated references to make this point in the subsequent sentence (P5para1).

1. **Reviewer #1: *The manuscript states “To meet this need….” (page 5) but it is somewhat confusing what need is being addressed. The preceding sentence suggests there may already be some clarity around use of PICCs based on the Choosing Wisely campaign, so it seems like a “jump” to justify the need for a panel of experts. Reconsider the background and argument for the need.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for the insightful comment and we have modified the sentence referenced to segue into the opportunity for MAGIC to contribute meaningfully to the literature (P5para2).

1. **Reviewer #1: *Where do the panel median ranges come from? (page 5). If the numbers are felt to be important, the reader needs a way to know what these mean.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for the comment and we have clarified the rating system (P5para2).

1. **Reviewer #1: *The sentence that begins with “Rather, PIC access in the dorsum of the hand…..” (page 7) is awkward in its current form. The phrase that follows the semi-colon should be included as a separate sentence.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment and we have modified the sentence referenced above as suggested (P7para2).

1. **Reviewer #1: *I agree with the reviewer suggestion to include a table of appropriate indications for PICCs to balance the inappropriate uses of PICCs.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewers for this suggestion and the table included now contains appropriate indications for PICCs to balance the inappropriate uses of PICCs formerly provided.

1. **Reviewer #2**: ***A revision should minimize use of passive voice. Examples: Page 4. “Thrombosis associated with VADs and especially with PICCs is well described”. Consider: Vascular access devices, particularly PICCs, pose substantial risk for thrombosis. Page 5. “To meet this need, a panel of experts was convened…..” Consider: We convened a panel of experts at the University of Michigan to engage in…..***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment and we have adopted a more active voice throughout the manuscript including in the sections the Reviewer expressly notes above (P4para2, P5para2).

1. **Reviewer #2:  *Citations: The Annals paper will need to be cited appropriately.***

**Authors Response:**

Thank you. Done.

1. ***Citation 23 appears to be incomplete.***

**Authors Response:**

Thank you. I have revised this citation.

1. **Reviewer #2**: ***Citations 33 and 34 seem incomplete and would benefit from spelling out the organization names (at minimum)?***

**Authors Response:**

Thank you. I have revised the citations.

1. **Reviewer #2**:  ***The link in citation 34 does not work. It should be corrected to the following (the manuscript omitted a dash):*** [***http://www.choosingwisely.org/clinician-lists/society-general-internal-medicine-peripherally-inserted-central-catheters-for-patient-provider-convenience/***](http://www.choosingwisely.org/clinician-lists/society-general-internal-medicine-peripherally-inserted-central-catheters-for-patient-provider-convenience/)***?***

**Authors Response:**

Thank you. I have revised this citation.

1. **Reviewer #2**: ***Citation 40. Check spelling. “Precuations” [sic]***

**Authors Response:**

Thank you. I have revised this citation.

1. **Reviewer #1**:  ***Congratulations on a concise and important manuscript on indications for PICCs. Overall the manuscript is ready to go. A couple things could be changed such as adding to the citations used for Thrombosis associated with PICCs since you indicate the complication is well described with PICCs. I would add the Chopra article on PICC thrombosis and Evans article which I know you are familiar! Other than that I think it is completely ready for publication. Well done.***

**Authors Response:**

Thank you very much. We have added the additional citations as you recommend.

1. **Reviewer #2**:  ***This manuscript summarizes and interesting event, the recommendations of a panel convened to discuss appropriate use of vascular access devices, specifically PICCs. There are several observations I can make about the current structure:***
	1. ***I was impressed by the writing throughout the manuscript, where you were able to describe the challenge and present landscape quite thoroughly yet concisely. That being said, in its current form, the Introduction and Background appeared to be redundant. It is this reviewer’s opinion that the Abstract could be shortened by as much as 50% and still serve its purpose***.

**Authors Response**:
We thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment and we have shortened the abstract by nearly 50% upon incorporating the suggestions of yourself and Reviewer #1.

* 1. ***The working title is stated as ‘PICC Appropriateness guide MAGIC initiative’ which is its current form seems confusing and more of a fragment then a well thought out title, to this reviewer (one of the target ‘busy hospitalists’ you hope to reach). This reviewer would recommend a simple title.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment and we have modified the title as noted above.

* 1. ***Your goal was to share the key recommendations from the MAGIC panel. I found the section breakdown to be intuitive, easy to follow, well written and appropriately cited***.

**Authors Response**:

Thank you very much.

* 1. ***The conclusion made some ambitious claims that this reviewer felt to be unsubstantiated. Comments that the recommendations ‘will be important for’ x,y,z, is mere conjecture. It would be best to reword these statements or remove them.***

**Authors Response**:

We thank the reviewer for this insightful comment and we have modified the text to reflect this feedback (P11para2).

1. **Reviewer #2: *Minor Comments: 1) Beware of fragments. Several found throughout your manuscript. Examples: - Conclusion: ‘Recommendations provided represent…’ - Conclusion: ‘Appropriateness statements guide indication, as well as…’***

**Authors Response*:***

Thank you. We have incorporated this recommendation upon editing the manuscript.

1. **Reviewer #2**:  ***Several sentences need rewording and are confusing in current form. Examples: - Introduction: ‘ Therefore an unmet need to define indications and promote utilization that conforms to optimal use currently exists. ‘ This is likely a fragment and certainly confusing. - Introduction: first sentence- ‘…remain a cornerstone for the delivery of therapy in inpatient and progressively outpatient medical care.’ This reviewer is not familiar with the notion of ‘progressively outpatient,’ and suggests rewording.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for this important feedback. We have incorporated these recommendations upon editing the manuscript.

1. **Reviewer #2**:  ***Figures: You shared when the MAGIC panel felt a PICC was inappropriate. This reviewer would have liked to see another figure with ‘appropriate’ use as well given the title of the manuscript and the stated goal of helping a ‘busy hospitalist’?***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for this important feedback, and we have modified the table accordingly.

1. **Reviewer #2**:  ***I In summary, this reviewer was most impressed preparation for this manuscript and enjoyed going through the reference list during this review. I am certain this manuscript will achieve the stated goal of helping the ‘busy hospitalist.’ In its current form, there remain some areas that need revision. This reviewer is confident that after revision publication will be possible.***

**Authors Response:**

We thank the reviewer for these thoughtful comments and the feedback which has strengthened our manusctipt.