

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 48724

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: the fine needle aspiration or fine needle biopsy dilemma. Is the best needle yet to come?

Reviewer's code: 00008599

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-30 17:59

Reviewer performed review: 2019-04-30 18:42

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input 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 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 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

Excellent, detailed review giving a great insight into this topic. Many institutions including us switched for solid lesions to FNB making ROSE not necessary and providing better tissue, yield, less passes and higher accuracy. For cystic lesions 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

can be used (not discussed in review). A 2.2% seeding rate with FNA of pancreatic lesions (Ref. 6) appears to be the exception. Only a few case reports have seeding of FNA of pancreatic lesions. Please run a spell check - there are many space issues.

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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 48724

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: the fine needle aspiration or fine needle biopsy dilemma. Is the best needle yet to come?

Reviewer's code: 00505466

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-30 07:39

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-01 12:33

Review time: 1 Day and 4 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 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

The authors provide a comprehensive review on EUS-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses. The review is too extensive and exhausting for the reader. The length should be definitely considerably reduced. Some other comments follow below. In the

abstract, I would suggest changing 'the difficulty in obtaining a core tissue with intact histological architecture' in the 'the inability of obtaining a core tissue with intact histological architecture'. Please explain the acronyms EUS, RCT, RR, etc at first appearance in the text. In the paragraph on the role of ROSE, I would suggest replacing pathologist by cytopathologist, since in some countries pathology and cytology are different specialties. 'Early data from three meta-analysis demonstrated that ROSE was associated with a statistically significant improvement in the adequacy rate [15; 18-19].' Please provide some data. 'Moreover, high quality studies recently published reported convertible conclusions [22].' Please replace 'convertible' with 'conflicting'. 'A meta-analysis published in 2016 compared EUS-FNA with and without ROSE, including RCT, with a ...'. Please change 'RCT' in 'RCTs'. I could imagine that the limited EUS-FNA passages with ROSE decreases procedure related morbidity. Are there any such data in the RCTs and meta-analyses? I would suggest to note the confidence interval (CI) in a different way. For example [RR 0.98 (CI: 0.91-1.06), (I2= 51%)] instead of [RR 0.98 (0.91, 1.06), (I2= 51%)]. '... but, in the absence of ROSE, FNB was associated with better diagnostic adequacy (P = 0.02).' please provide RR and CI. 'The authors [28] concluded that FNB without ROSE can supply EUS-FNA with ROSE without loss of diagnostic accuracy.' Please replace 'supply' by 'replace' or 'substitute'.. The authors provide only sample data from the last two FNB needle types. Please provide such data as well for the previous needle type so that some comparison is possible. 'Nevertheless, the most recently introduced FNB-needle is the Acquire™ needle ...'. It seems to me too much advertising and I would suggest omitting 'nevertheless'. Since it is supposed to be a literature review, references should be noted at the last paragraph of page 6, the first paragraph of page 7, the first paragraphs in the section on the evolution of the needles, the first paragraphs on use and types of suction, the first paragraph on the use of Stylet, etc. The authors note 'Up to now, the literature evidences do not support a strong

superiority of FNB over FNA.', but in the data following this phrase FNB seems to be superior in some studies. Is rephrasing of this opinion necessary here and in the conclusions? I would suggest collecting the data on 'Type of EUS-FNB needles' and 'FNB vs. FNB needles' in one heading, or to rephrase the second subtitle. 'Many studies have reported a correlation between EUS-FNA accuracy and lesion size.' References are required. I would suggest to change the header 'Discussion' in such as 'Practical recommendations', since during the previous sections there is already lots of data discussions. In figure 3, 'istitute' should be 'institute and the acronyms (AIP, ADK) should be explained in the legend. Editing of the manuscript is definitely needed. The references should be note in a consistent way and according to the Journal's guidelines.

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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 48724

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: the fine needle aspiration or fine needle biopsy dilemma. Is the best needle yet to come?

Reviewer's code: 03475362

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-30 10:04

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-02 15:39

Review time: 2 Days and 5 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

This manuscript clarified the dilemma of EUS-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses. Author mentioned the various condition of EUS-guided sampling following the part such as ROSE, technical aspects of EUS-FNA or FNB, different sampling techniques

(standard suction, stylet slow-pull, wet suction method), the different type of needle gauge, shapes (bevel type, shark head, franseen needle), and so on. Minor: 1. In page 4 line 5, author should cite Hikichi's paper (Hikichi et al. J Gastroentrol. 2009) in which authors firstly clarified the role of ROSE in EUS-FNA. 2. In page 20, author should use appropriate technical term as pancreatic NETs to pan-NENs according to the latest WHO classification of pancreatic tumors. 3. In page20 line30, author should change EUS□FNA to EUS-FNA. 4. In figure, reviewer could not notice the good specimen for histological evaluation. Please change the figure or attach an arrow to point out the specimen.

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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 48724

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: the fine needle aspiration or fine needle biopsy dilemma. Is the best needle yet to come?

Reviewer's code: 00183086

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-05 04:21

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-05 04:28

Review time: 1 Hour

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" 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 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

This is an interesting article with regard to EUS-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses. Nevertheless, neither the scientific quality nor the structure of the manuscript meets the criteria of publication in your distinguished journal. All the sections as well as



**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

the sub headings should be re-arranged. Grammatical errors should be corrected. Newly published articles should also be included.

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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 48724

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: the fine needle aspiration or fine needle biopsy dilemma. Is the best needle yet to come?

Reviewer's code: 03727100

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-05-05 15:07

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-05 15:15

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 authors, thank you for the precise report about EUS-FNA and EUS-FNB. The report is well written, however, There are a few points to be considered. Major point · The manuscript is too wordy to understand. Would you please make the tables to describe



**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

the detail of each study? The most suitable needle in each situation should be described in each chapter. Minor points · Could you add the citation that first describe the word “ROSE” (Hikichi et al. J Gastroenterol 322-328; 2009)? · In “the role of ROSE” section, what time should we puncture to overcome the situation without ROSE? · How much the histological diagnosability of the Shark Core needle is? · Would you add the reference that describe the differentiation of difficulty in each pancreatic part?

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 Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 48724

Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling of solid pancreatic masses: the fine needle aspiration or fine needle biopsy dilemma. Is the best needle yet to come?

Reviewer's code: 00034177

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Ying Dou

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-04-30 07:44

Reviewer performed review: 2019-05-11 05:26

Review time: 10 Days and 21 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 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 paper reports FNA needle vs FNB needle. This paper findings are very important for endosonographers. This paper itself is well written. But, this topics is not so new. Question 1. Please mention or clarify the definition of FNB needle. This is very important.



**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

2. 19G FNA needle is really FNA needle? 3. Aspiration(negative pressure) effects the sample quality. Please mention this point.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

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

BPG Search:

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