



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 47362

Title: EUS-FNA~Recent Topics and Technical Tips~

Reviewer's code: 03251468

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji (Quit in 2019)

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-20 11:34

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-20 13:36

Review time: 2 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

EUS-FNA~Recent Topics and Technical Tips~ The review is centered on EUS-FNA with particular focus on pancreatic lesions. It details factors which underline its usefulness in obtaining cytological or histological tissue and others which hinder its widespread use. The review's structure focuses on different areas of the EUS-FNA



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

technique giving tips for obtaining the best performance out of a technique which is as yet not present diffusely in all hospitals. Generally it is easy to follow even though a bit of language polishing is needed. In particular: Line 13 of the Abstract: otorhinology should be changed to Otorhinolaryngology or ear nose and throat diseases. The same should be changes in the figure legend. Lines 19-25 of core tips: there are some minor English errors which should be corrected; I have made a couple of suggestions – “In the era of cyto-pathological diagnosis of various malignant diseases, endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration cytology/biopsy (EUS-FNA) represents the most promising procedure for diagnosing various malignant diseases. However, no reports, up till now, have compared the utilities, faults, and technique of this procedure. In this review we have highlighted the recent topics and technical tips of EUS-FNA in the diagnostic process for various diseases, especially those which require tissue based diagnosis to determine treatment. Lines 28-30 Usefulness and current popularity of EUS-FNA: this sentence should be changed as it is badly worded, perhaps something like “In cases of difficult to reach lesions, where no histo-cytological tissue is obtainable, diagnosis has conventionally been determined using imaging techniques”. Lines 74-77 Factors affecting the diagnostic power of EUS-FNA and the establishment of standard procedures: the acronym ROSE has been used in line 74 but has not been specified; it is later specified in line 77 - this should be inverted. Line 131-133 Indications/contra-indications for EUS-FNA: I would eliminate the following comment “is currently restricted to the field of clinical research and there is no consensus on its safety” because it is clinically used and not restricted to research (though not widespread as already mentioned by the authors) and safety has already been commented upon in length, previously. Line 141-144: the following “In the actual practice of EUS-FNA, cases are sometimes encountered where there are significant respiratory fluctuations, or where it appears difficult to ensure the puncture route or



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

collect tissue because of blood vessels or organs located close to the lesion” should be eliminated as it is a repetition. Line 144: introduce should be substituted with describe. Figure 5: please state location and diagnosis seen in the histological image as well as immunoreactivity with which antibody,

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: 47362

Title: EUS-FNA ~Recent Topics and Technical Tips~

Reviewer's code: 00033061

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji (Quit in 2019)

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-24 07:06

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-25 15:18

Review time: 1 Day and 8 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 topic proposed by the authors is certainly interesting; however, there are some points that can be improved: - the title could be improved and made more interesting - the organization of the manuscript should be reviewed, with the insertion of chapters and paragraphs to make reading easier. Unfortunately, this review article has no clear



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

structure and lacks a proper paragraphing and sectioning to guide the reader through the review. - the authors did not discuss the different role and the difference between longitudinal and radial EUS. Furthermore they should specify that the possibility of performing cyto-histological sampling is only with the linear instrument - the manuscript, although not presenting particular errors, appears rather superficial, and really does not add anything significant to the current literature.

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: 47362

Title: EUS-FNA ~Recent Topics and Technical Tips~

Reviewer's code: 03706560

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji (Quit in 2019)

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-24 12:54

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-03 19:36

Review time: 9 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority) | <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of | (General priority) | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the |
| <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Major revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced |
| | | <input checked="" 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 is a narrative review about EUS-FNA. The paper does not add nothing new to the literature and needs to be improved, including English review from a native English with experience with these procedures. With the increase use of EUS-FNB I do not think this a good topic to be published in this journal. Authors need to modify the topic for



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

EUS-guided FNA or FNB and them revise the literature. Additionally, there are several systematic reviews and meta-analysis including these topics.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No