

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83164

**Title:** Tyrosine kinase inhibitors and HE positive breast cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 00505438

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-16 02:21

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-22 01:54

**Review time:** 5 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

Overall the title does not cover the topic of the subject as it outlines mostly current on going studies rather than discussing current treatment strategies and directions. I would suggest the addition of a table similar to table 1 outlining the studies to date and summarising their outcomes as making this far clearer. I would also suggest that as the paper states that it is outlining the improvement and current situations with regards to TKI, rather than using general terms such as superior or improved survival etc, that more statistical information is presented when discussing the studies such as percentages or the amount of improvement. The authors mention that little has been published in the past few years. It may be worthwhile to remind readers of the impact of the covid pandemic on the clinical trials which may have delayed recruitment, analysis and followup

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Oncology*

**Manuscript NO:** 83164

**Title:** Tyrosine kinase inhibitors and HER2 positive breast cancer

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06463509

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-01-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-01-23 09:19

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-23 09:34

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

The article reviews important clinical trials in HER+ breast cancer. I find the review a concise guide for clinicians and recommend accepting it with some minor revisions: - page 3, first line: "alone or trastuzumab alone in terms of PFS in postmenopausal women" - I would specify PFS values (95% CI too). - page 3: "It was concluded that tucatinib can significantly improve overall survival (OS) and delay the progression of brain metastasis, but not significantly improve PFS (10)." - give exact PFS and OS values -I would specify the total number of trials identified by the authors with the reviewed drugs. It's not the same when only 15 trials are presented out of 20 or out of 200.