



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 74718

Title: Significance of Serum Carcinoembryonic antigen in metastatic breast cancer Patients-A prospective study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05368193

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-07

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-29 04:57

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-05 11:10

Review time: 7 Days and 6 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 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

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

In this prospective article, the authors attempted to investigate the significance of serum carcinoembryonic antigen in patients with metastatic breast cancer. Although the article has high scientific quality and language quality, several minor flows need to be improved before publication. Minor Comments: 1. Article format, spacing, punctuation marks, spelling errors, abbreviations, frequencies and percentages should be reviewed wholly. 2. All tables should be reviewed, and modified appropriately as required. 3. Authors need to supplement recent references published in the last 5 years (A total of 13 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 5 years).



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

Manuscript NO: 74718

Title: Significance of Serum Carcinoembryonic antigen in metastatic breast cancer Patients-A prospective study

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05468953

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: DSc

Professional title: Postdoc

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2022-01-07

Reviewer chosen by: Ze-Mao Gong

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-28 10:08

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-28 14:14

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" 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

In this study, the authors found that elevated post-treatment S.CEA levels were associated with disease progression and poor response to therapy in breast cancer. Responders had significant fall in Serum CEA level but that was clinically significant in luminal breast cancer type. CEA is a broad-spectrum tumor biomarker with a diagnostic sensitivity of about 20% in breast cancer. Indicators of individual breast cancer tumor markers do not appear to be ideal. Breast cancer tumor markers are not suitable for the early diagnosis of breast cancer, but they play an irreplaceable role in the evaluation of prognosis and monitoring of recurrence and metastasis of breast cancer. Why not consider to combine it with other potential biomarkers, like cfDNA content? There are two reasons why CEA is elevated: one is caused by the tumor, and the other is that inflammatory factors also cause the elevation of CEA. So it's important to exclude inflammatory factor to design this project.. Generally, CEA value greater than 5.0 is considered positive, while in this paper, a value higher than 3.8 is considered positive. What is the basis for this? Another question is the number of patients. Due to the small sample size in this experiment, the significance of statistical results is affected. It is suggested to expand the sample results and re-analyze the results, which may be more reliable.