

## **ANSWER TO REVIEWERS AND EDITORIAL OFFICE**

### Reviewer #1

1. The retrospective nature of the study is a limitation of the study and should be stated in the discussion section.

Thanks for the suggestion. We have added that sentence in the discussion.

2. The study was approved by the Institution Research Board. However, did the patients signed a consent allowing the use of the information for research? Is there a protocol for this approval?

Thank you for the comments. Yes, the study was approved by the IRB and includes authorization for the treatment and data use for research. We have added the sentence "This study received ethical approval from the Inhouse Local Ethics and Clinical Committee (Code: 16.04.0940-GHM) the 27<sup>th</sup> of April, 2016".

3. The Statistical analysis paragraph is too confusing and should be clearly described. For example, the phrase "Patients' information was obtained from the patients' records, an ad hoc database was created and data from the records were entered into it." This phrase is not a statistical analysis.

Yes, you are right, thanks for the comments. We have deleted "ad hoc database was created and data from de records were entered into it".

4. The results were confusedly presented and should be re-evaluated. Some results were not appropriate for a result section. For example, the phrase "According to other groups' experience, the incidence of involvement in the cALND beyond the SLN was from 40 to 58% when presence of MAC, while for mic it fell to 20% (23) and for ITC (isolated tumor cells) was roughly 12%." In this reviewer opinion, the other group experience is not a result, since author did not state that will perform a in silico analysis using a different data. This type of information should used in discussion section.

You are completely right. Results should just show our outcomes and any comparison to other series should be reported in discussion. We have moved that information to discussion.

5. Results poorly presented in the univariate analysis. The information provided in this topic; it is not result. This information should be in methods. In this subtopic of the result section, authors are describing information analyzed in the univariate analysis and this allows the methods section.

Yes, we agree with you. We have moved the parameters analyzed in the univariate analysis to "Methods". We have left the statistically significant ones in results

6. There are some typos that need to be adjusted. i.e. discussion section "respectively..".

Thanks for the info. We have reviewed the manuscript and adjusted all the wrong typos

7. The conclusion section is overstated. i.e. "The great advantage of applying the PCRI preoperatively allows the Tumor Board and the patient to participate in the decision-making, contributing to the personalization of breast cancer treatment. Further studies are necessary to validate feasibility and accuracy of this PCRI". Consider re-organizing the section.

Yes, you are right. We have deleted the sentence "The great advantage of applying the PCRI preoperatively allows the Tumor Board and the patient to participate in the decision-making, contributing to the personalization of breast cancer treatment."

## Language quality

Our native-English speaker has edited the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability.

## EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

### *Science editor:*

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a Clinical Trials Study of the Macrometastasis at selective lymph node biopsy. The topic is within the scope of the WJCO.

(1) Classification: Grade B

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is interesting.

A protocol for this approval should be mentioned. You are right. We have added the sentence "This study received ethical approval from the Inhouse Local Ethics and Clinical Committee (Code: 16.04.0940-GHM) the 27<sup>th</sup> of April, 2016" in material and methods.

The Statistical analysis paragraph need to be modified. Yes, it has been modified

The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered Questions have been answered

(3) Format: There are 4 tables and 1 figure

(4) References: A total of 45 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years

(5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference

(6) Reference's recommendations (kindly remind): The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to [editorialoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wjgnet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. We have not received any improper reference recommendation by the peer reviewer

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. The manuscript is reviewed by a native English speaker.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search.

4 Supplementary comments: No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCO.

5 Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

Please see author's contributions attached

(2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

Please, see pictures/ figures separately in power point

(3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. Reference list was changed.

(4) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text; Article Highlights have been added at the end of manuscript, after conclusions.

The authors need to fill out the CONSORT 2010 Statement with page numbers

Please see attached the CONSORT 2020 filled.

(5) Please upload the primary version (PDF) of the Informed Consent Form (Surgical procedures or other) that has been signed by the patients in the study, prepared in the official language of the authors' country to the system; for example, authors from China should upload the Chinese version of the document, authors from Italy should upload the Italian version of the document, authors from Germany should upload the Deutsch version of the document, and authors from the United States and the United Kingdom should upload the English version of the document, etc. Example: Download our sample of signed informed consent-Case report, at <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>.

Please see attached consent forms (surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy)

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.