

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Meta-Analysis

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27583 (30116)

**Title:** Is there a difference between 19G core biopsy needle and 22G core biopsy needle in diagnosing the correct etiology?: A meta-analysis and systematic review

**Reviewer's code:** 02723208

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-06-12 11:54

**Date reviewed:** 2016-07-04 00:20

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is worth to be published. I suggest minor changes: 1. Please state years considered and language; 2. Data included in the meta-analysis were always obtained by intention to-treat analysis of the original data? Authors should state this. 3. Only two of the included studies compared directly G19 and G22 needles. In my opinion this fact may limit the strength of the conclusions of this meta-analysis. Authors should discuss this point in the discussion section. 4. Do the results of the meta-analysis change, when studies published only as abstracts are excluded? Were additional data obtained from the Authors? 5. The authors found a surprising low specificity for 22G needle; did they have any comment about this finding? 6. In Table 1 it was stated that Strand et al. studied pancreatic cystic lesion. I think this was not correct. 7. I think that the flow chart (Figure 1) is misleading: I can not understand the difference between the two last boxes at the bottom of the figure.