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Reviewer’s report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

I would like to congratulate the authors on this original research and on their contribution to the literatures in the area of mesothelioma and medical thoracoscopy. There has been less cases of malignant pleural mesothelioma over the years due to the several precaution methods taken by construction workers and to much less use of asbestos in the western countries. I think this article emphasis on the safety and high diagnostic yield of using medical thoracoscopy in diagnosing Mesothelioma.

-The article reflects tremendous effort from the authors. The language of the manuscript needs to be reexamined especially in the areas where there are long sentences and multiple pieces of data combined together.

-Expressing statistics by positive or negative predictive values will make more sense to the readers. For example: Page 11 line 31:

'The specificity of chest CT for identifying pleural tumors is about 88–95%, while the sensitivity is about 36–45%'

-The manuscript mentions in many areas the phrase "prognostic factors". It is much more helpful for the readers if the phrase is more definitive for example: poor or good prognostic factor & positive of negative prognostic factor.

-In the methods section, many elements were defined under the result section and in my opinion it should be mentioned under the method section. For example:

Page 5 Line 23: The suspected areas of the pleura were biopsied during medical throcoscopy. What kind of areas? These areas should be described in the methods section.

Page 5 Line 50: What type of pleural radiographic assessments? CT scan? CXR? Others? These was mentioned in the result and Table 1 but also it should be defined in the methods section.
How you define small, moderate or large pleural effusion?

Finally, what is the reason for the delay in diagnosing 5 patients with mesothelioma? What happened to then? was the medical thoracoscopy inconclusive or limited? Operatory issues?

I recommend publishing the article after major revision

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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