



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 55509

Title: Comparison of the Reverse bevel vs Franseen type Endoscopic Ultrasound needle

Reviewer's code: 01467632

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FASGE, MD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Director, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-05-25 07:49

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-25 13:40

Review time: 5 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study by Chow et al. describes a retrospective cohort of 226 patients undergoing EUS FNB with either 22G ProCore or 22G Acquire needles, performed on different solid/mixed GI lesions (both pancreatic and non-pancreatic). Despite the relative low number of patients, the heterogeneity of included GI lesions and the retrospective design of the study, this paper is of interest as this comparison has never been performed before. Nevertheless I have some minor considerations for the authors: - when the authors mention univariate and multivariate analyses, they might want to consider to call them "univariable" and "multivariable" (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1365-3016.2008.00966.x> and <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3518362/>) - the abstract might require some corrections ("associated with adequate") as the outcome section ("The primary outcome was to compare identify factors") - the authors might consider to include also this study in their discussion PMID: 32408361



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 55509

Title: Comparison of the Reverse bevel vs Franseen type Endoscopic Ultrasound needle

Reviewer's code: 02951945

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2020-05-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-05-25 15:35

Reviewer performed review: 2020-05-26 16:49

Review time: 1 Day and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

We congratulate the authors for a well-designed and well written retrospective Cohort study. Retrospective cohort study to compare the performance of reverse bevel (RB) FNB needle with franseen geometry (FG) FNB needle- the authors found that FG needle is superior to RB needle in acquiring adequate tissue and attaining higher number of cell groups for solid and mixed lesions. The superior performance of FG needle is probably due to its three dimension (Franseen geometry) cutting tip which may have enhanced tissue acquisition Specific comments 1) Very interesting and well conducted trial 2) Results are very promising 3) As authors wrote, larger multi center prospective randomized trials will be needed to confirm the results 4) Manuscript is well organized and concise