

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 52069

**Title:** Can the wet suction technique change the efficacy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for diagnosing autoimmune pancreatitis type 1?

A prospective single-arm study

**Reviewer's code:** 03552382

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Author's country:** Japan

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-10-17 06:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-10-24 12:43

**Review time:** 7 Days and 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This prospective study presents good results in a small number of patients. The trial was not randomised, and the historical cohort represents the biggest weak point of this study. The WET suction represents a new EUS puncture technique that is worth further investigation in a bigger number of patients. Although the paper was revised for language editing from a professional language editing service, I found uncommon words in the text. Nevertheless, the message is clear and the results and past and current literature are good discussed and such study place the groundknowledge for further investigations. The study has to be confirmed with a RCT with the same needle size. Just one question: how many ml of Saline are injected , after the stylet is removed? 10 ml? 5 ml?

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 52069

**Title:** Can the wet suction technique change the efficacy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for diagnosing autoimmune pancreatitis type 1?

A prospective single-arm study

**Reviewer's code:** 02440467

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Academic Research, Adjunct Professor, Doctor

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Author's country:** Japan

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-10-17 06:26

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-10-26 16:24

**Review time:** 9 Days and 9 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear Editor, thanks for imitating me to review this article entitled "Can the wet suction technique change the efficacy of EUS-FNA for diagnosing autoimmune pancreatitis type 1? A prospective single-arm study". This study aims to compare a novel "wet suction" technique (WEST) with the conventional FNA technique (CFNAT) of EUS-guided FNA using FNA needle or EUS-TCB in diagnosing autoimmune pancreatitis. The Authors concluded that the histopathological accuracy by WEST EUS-FNA was statistically superior to that by the standard EUS-FNA method or EUS-TCB. The paper is quite well written, and the Authors admit the limitations of the study (sample size in a single institution and historical controls used as a control group) I have only small remarks and questions: • Please, explain what is "lymphocyte fibrillation" (introduction, line 3) • The following sentence in material and methods "This study was a single-arm prospective study intended to clarify the efficacy of WEST EUS-FNA for diagnosing type 1 AIP" should be anticipated at the end of the introduction as "The aim of our study is to clarify..." • The following sentence: "according to the methods in a previous report by Attam et al." Probably should be better "according to the methods described in a previous report by Attam et al." • Please specify if in this study, a cross-check and grading by a second cytopathologist was used. If a cross-check by a second cytopathologist was not used, please shortly comment on this lack as a possible further limitation of the study.

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**<https://www.wjgnet.com>**

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

***BPG Search:***

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 52069

**Title:** Can the wet suction technique change the efficacy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration for diagnosing autoimmune pancreatitis type 1?

A prospective single-arm study

**Reviewer's code:** 01489017

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's country:** Sweden

**Author's country:** Japan

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-10-19 10:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-11-04 16:37

**Review time:** 16 Days and 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The manuscript by Sugimoto and colleagues represent a valid contribution to the important question how to obtain the best possible biopsy from the pancreas via EUS for the diagnosis of pancreatic pathology, especially autoimmune pancreatitis (AIP). The study can be determined as a pilot due to the small number of patients (n = 11) in the experimental arm. Furthermore, controls were historical. This may be due to the fact that the WEST method is virtually the standard these days? During which time period were the control group (DRY) samples taken? The results as they are presented are clear. Nevertheless, there are some problems that need to be addressed prior to publication in any journal. 1) Why was AIP type 2 excluded? Because the serum IgG4 served as a diagnostic criterium for confirmed AIP according to ICDC? Were patients operated to see the sensitivity and specificity of the method? 2) Controls - were they at least age & sex matched? Wer they matched according to the kind (make) of the biopsy needle? 3) Were all biopsies taken from the same area within the pancreas, e.g. transgastric approach and/or transduodenal approach?

## **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☒ No

### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No