# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41624

**Title:** Assessment of endosonographers in training

**Reviewer's code:** 00045148

**Reviewer's country:** Taiwan

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-06

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-14

**Review time:** 8 Days

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| [ ] Grade E: Do not publish | [ ] Grade D: Rejection | [ ] Major revision | [ ] Advanced |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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript of mini-review addressed the issue of clinical education in EUS with respect to the evaluation of endosonographers in training with the aim to give an informative overview of the topic. It should be of great interest to the readers about the detail and the present status of EUS training world wide since the learning of EUS was

suspected to be a tough one.     The author mentioned about significant variation in the study methodology, in the variables measured, and in the criteria for competence, when comparing the previous studies. These variations make the results of these studies difficult to compare in between.     In my opinion, EUS assessment protocol should be classified into two levels: Basic level-diagnosis of lesions of esophagus, stomach and duodenum, may be with basic FNA. Advanced level- interventional procedure like difficult EUS-FNA, CPN, pseudocyst drainage, vascular intervention)     About the content of Table 1 It is my opinion that this table is not easy for the readers ' understanding. Is it possible to make some modification for the table to be more understandable?

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

*Google Search:*

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No


*BPG Search:*

[   ] The same title

[   ] Duplicate publication

[   ] Plagiarism

[Y] No

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 41624

**Title:** Assessment of endosonographers in training

**Reviewer's code:** 02468626

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Date sent for review:** 2018-09-06

**Date reviewed:** 2018-09-17

**Review time:** 11 Days

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors presented a review on the topic of EUS training and learning curve. The author performed a very good job reviewing all the literature available on this topic and presenting it in a readable, understandable and convenient format. I think this manuscript represents a very useful guide both for all the mentors who want to assess

their role while teaching EUS and for the trainees who want to assess their expertise.


**INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

*Google Search:*

[    ] The same title

[    ] Duplicate publication

[    ] Plagiarism

[Y] No


*BPG Search:*

[    ] The same title

[    ] Duplicate publication

[    ] Plagiarism

[Y] No