

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/med-20-25>

Article Type: Review Article

Manuscript ID: MED-2020-MIMSLC-03(MED-20-25)

Title: New tools for endoscopic ultrasound-guided biopsy of mediastinal nodes

Reviewer #1

I have read with great interest the manuscript by Yang et al, which gives a thorough and high-quality overview of the present and future issues concerning endobronchial ultrasound instrumentation. In my opinion the manuscript is therefore suitable for publication.

Comment 1: The only minor point concerns line 5 of page 15, where the name of the Author and Journal in round brackets has probably to be changed with the number of the reference.

Reply 1: Changed! Thank you.

Reviewer #2

The subject is a current topic of general interest and describes in details the EBUS-TBNA tools and options available nowadays. The paper is well written and needs minor changes

Comment 1: Please change the title expression “New tools”...: the article represents a current technical literature review and does not add any information on new equipments.

Reply 1: The original title was given by Mediastinum journal. Title now changed to “Review of tools for...”

Comment 2: There are many companies that produce EBUS-TBNA needles, the ones who are listed in the article are not the only ones (for example the Medi-Globe company ecc.)

Reply 2: We have changed it to read “three companies that produce the majority of EBUS-TBNA needles”.

Comment 3: Should be useful and of interest for the readers to investigate the capacity of different needle size in obtaining adequate tissue for molecular testing.

Reply 3: We do have a section written up on the data behind different needles and tissue adequacy for molecular testing, but removed it from this paper as it did not seem to fit into the flow of a general review of novel EBUS tools. However, we agree that this information is useful and may be of interest to readers.

Comment 4: *25-G needle/GI procedures*: remove this paragraph.

Reply 4: We included this section on 25G needles to be more inclusive of all the needles in EBUS-TBNA even though it is not very common. We thought it was important

to mention a few things about the 25G since some centers may be using it.

Comment 5: Please review the paragraph 293-299: elucidate better what you refer to, exactly, when comparing EBUS-TBNA to other diagnostic procedures in terms of delay of diagnosis. Furthermore I suggest to avoid comparing diagnostic performance of EBUS-TBNA and PET/CT

Reply 5: The “other” diagnostic procedures done in the study were bronchoscopy with BAL, transbronchial biopsy, pleural biopsy, pleural fluid analysis, TTNA, surgical biopsy.

Comment 6:(line 294: small cell ? probably non small cell).

Reply 6: This was referring to small cell. Please see link for the paper. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/crj.12556>

Comment 7: About the section “Future direction” I would remove lines 305-307 concerning electromagnet navigational system. In addition, it would be useful to explain better how the iNOD system procedure is done in practice.

Reply 7: The iNod system is not currently available in practice at many locations. There were a few clinical trials that investigated the iNod system but it is not yet used in clinical practice at this time so did not expand further on it.