

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 33577

Title: Current State and Controversies in Fertility Preservation in Women with Breast Cancer

Reviewer's code: 02104609

Reviewer's country: Canada

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-02-17

Date reviewed: 2017-02-18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well-written review article for WJO.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 33577

Title: Current State and Controversies in Fertility Preservation in Women with Breast Cancer

Reviewer's code: 00742054

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-03-16

Date reviewed: 2017-03-23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for writing an interesting review article on this important issue! Please see my comments on the attached manuscript. Thank you and best of luck!

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 33577

Title: Current State and Controversies in Fertility Preservation in Women with Breast Cancer

Reviewer's code: 00181208

Reviewer's country: Switzerland

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2017-03-16

Date reviewed: 2017-04-05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a useful brief review. I would suggest adding a table with the different fertility options discussed and advantages –disadvantages as well as efficacy rates and established versus experimental status. Another table with specific regimens and doses of ovarian stimulation for IVF would be of interest. Addition of the risk of sterility with specific regimens used in breast cancer (to supplement the information given in table for individual drugs) and comparison with regimens used in other cancers such as lymphoma (also a common practice problem in oncology) would be desirable as a comparative reference. A couple of typos: -p. 7 line 5 should be: "...is shown not to be the case." -P. 11 last sentence of 3rd paragraph is not clear what it means that the letrozol-gonadotropin protocol is associated with DFS. Please clarify.