# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Gastroenterology  
**Manuscript NO:** 75127  
**Title:** An Update on Endoscopic Ultrasound-Guided Liver Biopsy  
**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed  
**Peer-review model:** Single blind  
**Reviewer’s code:** 02445721  
**Position:** Peer Reviewer  
**Academic degree:** PhD, MD  
**Professional title:** Associate Professor  
**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Thailand  
**Author’s Country/Territory:** United States  
**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-01-16  
**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique  
**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-16 23:55  
**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-21 01:23  
**Review time:** 4 Days and 1 Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
<th>[Y] Grade D: Fair</th>
<th>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (General priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[Y] Major revision</td>
<td>[ ] Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>[Y] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewer</td>
<td>Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous</td>
<td>[ ] Onymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Jan 21, 2022 Dear Authors submitting to WJG Manuscript ID – WJG75127 Manuscript Title: An Update on Endoscopic Ultrasound-Guided Liver Biopsy All Author List: Shiva Rangwani, et al. Manuscript Type: MINIREVIEWS The endoscopic ultrasound-guided liver biopsy (EUS-LB) was an effective alternative to percutaneous and trans-jugular liver biopsy (PC and TJ-LB). (1) EUS-LB demonstrated equivalent diagnostic yield, provided adequate specimen and facilitated liver biopsy for lesions in the left lobe of the liver, obese patients or patients with ascites. (2, 3) Compared to conventional procedures, EUS-LB had less post-procedural pain and recovery time. (2, 3) This study compared the benefit and drawbacks of three methods of liver biopsy and highlighted evidence-based data of the technique and devices of EUS-LB. Comments
1. The use of EUS-LB for the tissue diagnosis of liver mass or focal lesion was promising. (4, 5, 6) and it will be better if you can add data of EUS-LB in cases of liver mass or focal lesion. 2. Please provide references for the first paragraph of the general technique section. 3. The slow-pull technique was mentioned in previous systematic review and meta-analysis. (7) Please provide a comparison advantage and disadvantage between the suction and slow-pull techniques. 4. "Through our literature review, it appears the 1-pass 1 actuation technique is the most common mode of the EUS-LB acquisition". Please provide references for this sentence in the needle Pass/Actuation section. 5. In the Needle Selection: Tip and Design section, the comparison of EUS-LB with FNB and FNA should be separated from the design of needle tips. Please rewrite this section for a better understanding of the readers. 6. In the previous review, the EUS-guided portal pressure measurement and intervention had details such as the technique of venous catheterization, the instrument and the interpretation of the result. (8) Please add more
information on the EUS-guided portal pressure measurement or remove this part from the review article. References
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This paper is short of innovation and creativity. These articles also discuss the advantages of this technology and the existing liver puncture technology, the selection of puncture needle, etc. (PMID: 30846147, 32218838, 3482658). At the same time, there are relatively few charts in this paper, which can not make readers understand the principle and operation of this technology. It is suggested to improve the new progress in other aspects of this technology.
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This is a minireview of updates in EUS-guided liver biopsy, a technique that has been gaining increasing popularity and acceptance among the gastroenterology community. This review provides a quick summary of the latest literature in terms of the safety and efficacy and EUS-guided liver biopsy in comparison to traditional techniques of liver biopsy, namely percutaneous- and transjugular guided liver biopsy. This review is well-written and includes the most important publications in the area of EUS-guided liver biopsy. The overall conclusion based on the most recent published studies is this technique is more effective than traditional techniques providing higher specimen length and more CPT while keeping an excellent safety profile. The review also discusses a number of technical aspects in performing EUS-guided liver biopsy highlighting some deficiencies such as the use of suction and needle type. This review does not have any major limitations. It is well-written, includes the most important data in the field summarized in an-easy to read fashion. The only grammatical correction needed is on page 9, line 12 in the sentence "A 2021 study found showed that EUS-LB using ...." should be corrected to "A 2021 study showed that EUS-LB using ..." This review should be accepted as it is.
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It was a pleasure to read the minireview titled: “An Update on Endoscopic Ultrasound-Guided Liver Biopsy”. The manuscript is well-written and very informative. It compared the 3 main techniques for obtaining a liver biopsy from many aspects. General considerations: Some punctuations are missing, e.g. commas after “however” and “Similarly”. Introduction Page 4: Wilsons disease, change to Wilson disease or Wilson’s disease Alfa-1 Anti-trypsin Deficiency, Hemochromatosis: remove capital letters Methods of Liver Biopsy Page 6: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration was first done in 1993 and EUS-LB was first described by in 2007.12,13 Mention the authors in references 12 and 13: described by-------in 2007. Needle Pass / Actuation: Page 9: Needle pass refers to the amount of times a needle is introduced into the liver parenchyma through puncture of the liver capsule, Change to: Needle pass refers to the number of times a needle is introduced into the liver parenchyma through puncture of the liver capsule, while actuation refers to the amount of back-and-forth motions are made in a specified needle pass. Change to: while actuation refers to the number of back-and-forth motions made in a specified needle pass. Needle Selection: Size Page 9: As time progressed, so did a proclivity for smaller gauge needles in EUS-LB. After the aforementioned statement the authors included several reports where gauge 19 was better than gauge 22. Do they mean that these 19 G are smaller than the sizes 14G-16G mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph? These statements need more clarification. Although there is a mention of pediatric patients at the end of the manuscript, but the authors did not elaborate on any studies using EUS-LB in pediatric age group. The table is very informative and the comparison is crystal clear.
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The authors address all of the suggestions and questions.
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This minireview article is well-written and informative, which discusses the advance of endoscopic ultrasound-guided (EUS) liver biopsy in comparison to the traditional techniques, percutaneous (PC) or transjugular (TJ) liver biopsy. Since EUS-LB is safer and multi-functional, it has been popularly accepted in recent years. This review can help to introduce this technology to clinical practitioners. The authors have carefully revised the manuscript according to the peer-reviewers' comments. However, several parts of the edited manuscript still need to be revised and clarified as below: 1. In the "Methods of Liver Biopsy" section, page 7, "...EUS-LB was first described by in Mathew 2007" should be changed to "...EUS-LB was first described by Mathew in 2007". 2. In the "Methods of Liver Biopsy -- Comparisons" section, page 10, the author cited a 2021 study by Patel HK et al., showing that EUS-LB liver biopsy was similar to TJ-LB in CPTs acquisition (EUS-LB vs. TJ-LB, P = 1). The abstract of this latest publication only provided this P > 0.05. Since I can not access the full text of this citation, the author should confirm this P-value. 3. In the "Technique of EUS-guided liver biopsy" section, page 10, the sentence "Since the inception of EUS-LB in 2007 with a Tru-Cut core biopsy needle (QuickCore, Cook Medical, Winston Salem, NC) multiple studies have aimed at optimizing EUS-LB technique." It should add a comma. 4. In the "Technique of EUS-guided liver biopsy" section, page 12, "A 2020 metanalysis" should change to "A 2020 meta-analysis". 5. The style of the P-value should be uniform as "P" or "p" in the whole article. 6. In the "Future Research and Practice" section, page 18, the full name of the acronym LFTs should be provided.