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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revision

1. This is a retrospective comparative study of the usefulness of 22G needle and 25G needle in the EUS-FNA of the pancreatic masses. A previous metaanalysis showed that there is a non-significant differences in sensitivity (78% vs 91%), and 100% specificity, with no difference in the number of passes or complications (Affolter et al. Dig Dis Sci 2013), which is consistent with the presented results. The reported diagnostic accuracy for core histology specimens is 45% for the 25G needles (Sakamoto et al 2009) and 60 to 87% for the 22G needles(Sakamoto 2009, Ramesh 2015, Bang 2012). In the present study, the diagnostic accuracy by using the 22G needle was only 34%. Please explain.

2. Methodology problems. “The number of needle passes for obtaining histological specimen was limited to 2 to prevent procedure-related complications” Please give details on the presumed complications or explain why there were 5 passes for cytology and only 2 for histology. This could conduct to unreliable conclusions.

Minor essential revision

1. Please define “macroscopically sufficient material “ for histological evaluation

Discretionary revision

1. Please insert 22G group and 25G group in the table 2.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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