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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors report and review an uncommon condition in a thorough and comprehensive way. The following issues could be raised and altered in the manuscript accordingly.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached).

How was the information obtained on the episode of venous cannulation 8 years before? Patient recall or review of the medical record concerning the hospital admission?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. Were the lower limbs veins assessed for reflux or aneurysm?
2. The vein wall appears normal. Would you like to carry the pathology study further ahead?
3. Finally, perhaps there is too much ado about obtaining informed consent before peripheral venous cannulation due to the risk of venous aneurysm formation. After all this is an extremely rare event, where association to vein catheterization is merely anecdotal, while vein cannulation is an otherwise routine and straightforward procedure. I would consider physician awareness of the condition enough.
4. What were the characteristics of the catheter, namely the calibre?
5. How long was it in place?
6. Were there inflammatory signs?
7. Did a haematoma develop upon its removal?
8. Did the duplex scan show thrombus inside the aneurysm or elsewhere in the upper limb veins?
9. The antecubital veins are commonly used for drawing blood but not so for cannulation. Did the patient draw blood repeatedly during the hospital stay or afterwards?
10. Why was the catheter placed so proximal? Dehydration? Was the patient obese? Some other reason?

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions
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