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Reviewer's report:

Comments:
This paper looks at EUS guided micro histology in the diagnosis of metastatic lesions in the pancreas.

1. I am not clear on the inclusion criteria for the study. The authors need to state clearly what the inclusion criteria are - how did they select their patient population?

2. Clearer description of patients who presented with a pancreas mass and no previous history and those who did have a previous history of cancer.

3. Statistical plan is lacking. Variables should be quoted as median and range +/- 95% confidence intervals not mean.

4. Need a description of how sensitivity, specificity have been calculated and in this instance ROC should be part of the statistical plan. There is no mention of what statistical package the authors have used – this should be included.

5. The results are not clearly presented.

6. The demographic table is confusing what does control of disease mean, initial staging and before identification of the primary cancer?

7. Figures needed – ROC curve, survival curves would be helpful.

8. Do the authors have any evidence from these patients concerning the clinical utility of cytology?

9. The authors need to take note of the following references: DeWitt et al Pancreas. 2012 Nov 9 49 patients. Pancreatology. 2012 Brais et al.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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