

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67500

Title: Non-small-cell lung cancer with epidermal growth factor receptor L861Q-L833F benefits from both afatinib and osimertinib: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05622594

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-10 07:39

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-10 10:22

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Zhang and colleagues report a case report of a stage IV NSCLC patient harboring EGFR L861Q-L833F compound mutations benefits from both afatinib and osimertinib. I have few comments. - The authors use the phrase “our study” in the conclusion section and the core tip section, but this is only a case report. Please revise the description. - The authors reported that they detected the compound mutation by NGS, but please provide more details about the NGS method. - In the discussion section, the authors only mention the effect of osimertinib on compound mutation. However, there is a report that afatinib is more effective in the treatment of compound mutation (Kohsaka, et al. Sci Transl Med 2017), and in this case, afatinib actually had a better long-term response than osimertinib. Please add a discussion on the effect of afatinib on compound mutation.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67500

Title: Non-small-cell lung cancer with epidermal growth factor receptor L861Q-L833F benefits from both afatinib and osimertinib: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05908908

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-08

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-12 01:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-12 04:59

Review time: 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. This article is an original article describing a very rare case of NSCLC with multiple genetic mutations. Abstracts, introductions, case presentations, and discussions are very well discussed. 2. Please explain the biopsy technique that was first performed on line 73 of the statement 3. Please clarify that the word “Brian” on line 74 is correct or incorrect 4. Please clarify the statements on lines 74-75 regarding metastases in the brain, is it one lesion or many lesions? This contrasts with the explanation in Figure 2 which only shows 1 metastatic lesion 5. Please attach the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors 1.1 form and explain how to determine “Partial Response” in this patient. 6. Please explain in the discussion section why the NGS examination can reveal complex genetic mutations compared to the PCR examination. Is there any suggestion to the reader when the NGS examination should be used to improve patient outcomes?