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Reviewer's report:

The authors are to be congratulated on a really very interesting paper that is both an extremely important question but also very well designed and executed. I do however have a few questions.

1) In your methodology you use greater the one tissue procedure as a cut off. If a patient had a TTNB for their lung mass and an EBUS to investigate a PET positive mediastinal node. This would meet most countries guidelines as appropriate care but in your structure would make it "complex." Do you think this is appropriate as it is a pretty common occurrence in the treatable patient. Do you think this could influence your results or at least lump together different patient groups with differing quality gaps?

2) Do you have protocol's that can limit your timeliness? For instance the temporal relationship between pet and biopsy. Some regions have a set time between the two. Is that present in your area and would geographic and institutional factors influence your results.

3) Can you explain why a statistically significant more patients got treatment who were complex? Does this suggest a bias?

4) I thought the discussion was appropriate and well balanced. More work into the why of the problems is needed but likely is out of scope for the publication.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

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

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.
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