



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55355

**Title:** The diagnostic value of liquid-based cytology and smears cytology in pancreatic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00070509

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Zhou Tang (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-17 04:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-20 04:58

**Review time:** 3 Days

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

LBC is a popular type of cytology preparation nowadays. Moreover, LBC has many advantages rather than conventional smear (CS) in other organs, for example thyroid gland, salivary glands and uterine cervix. This is a meta-analysis to compare the diagnostic accuracy of LBC and CS in the pancreatic lesions. I think this manuscript is a valuable study to select a better cytology preparation.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55355

**Title:** The diagnostic value of liquid-based cytology and smears cytology in pancreatic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 03646542

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Research Fellow, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Denmark

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Zhou Tang (Quit in 2020)

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-19 22:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-30 08:58

**Review time:** 10 Days and 10 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Pan et al have performed a thorough review of EUS-FNA cytology. The paper is very well written, interesting and easy to read. I have a few suggestions to the authors (and some methodological concerns):

1. Is this the correct e-mail address for the corresponding author? xxxzzzyyy@foxmail.com
2. There are a few minor errors in the text, please check grammar, spelling and the use of spacing
3. End of page 5, (Biodyne, Seongnam, Korea) is mentioned twice?
4. Page 6, I suggest the search string be moved into supplementary material. Please check the correct amount of brackets used, and the use of wildcard as pancreatic and pancrea\* would essentially yield the same result. I am unable to reproduce your results, when I try to perform the search?
5. End of page 6 in the study Selection section, please clarify what is the reference standard.
6. Page 7, end of Data extraction section, I hope that this is merely a spelling error, but sensitivity is calculated as  $TP/(TP+FN)$
7. Page 7, Risk of bias section: you state that quality assessment was independently assessed, by whom? And how many authors? This is a crucial methodological question, as it affects the interpretation of the results.
8. Page 8, Results/study selection section: "Thus, 8 studies[7-14] with a total of x patients were ultimately eligible for the meta-analysis". What is x studies? Furthermore, it would seem that the section is repeated twice.
9. Page 9, Diagnostic performance section. You construct 2x2 tables, but I don't recall reading about the definitions of positive and negative outcome? Is it positive or negative for malignancy? This needs to be specified.
10. There is a very high heterogeneity between the study, so I would suggest a more cautious approach when concluding that there is a difference between the methods.
11. Furthermore, you mention apparent publication bias in Discussion section, as a majority of the studies originated from Asia. I am afraid that this is not the definition of publication bias. The latter occurs when the results of one study, influences the decision



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](https://www.wjgnet.com)

to publish the study or not. Publication bias is usually examined through funnel plots of standard error as a function of the effect size, and corresponding statistical tests.



## RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 55355

**Title:** The diagnostic value of liquid-based cytology and smears cytology in pancreatic endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration: A meta-analysis

**Reviewer's code:** 00070509

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-05-11 23:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-05-11 23:40

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

This meta-analysis conducted comparative analysis of the diagnostic efficacy of liquid-based cytology (LBC) and smear cytology (SC) using endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) in diagnosing benign and malignant pancreatic lesions, and concluded that there was a higher sensitivity of LBC to SC in the diagnosis of pancreatic lesions. This manuscript is reportable to select a diagnostic modality for diagnosing benign and malignant pancreatic lesions.