

ANSWER TO PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68036

Title: Case report: PIK3CA mutation in non-metastatic triple-negative breast cancer as a potential biomarker of early relapse

Corresponding author: Guillermo Arturo Valencia M.D.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO REVIEWERS

First author (Anonymous, number ID 05446731)

1. "The "Discussion" section was too lengthy. The authors should summarize and shorten to make the readers understand them. In addition, this was the only one case report, and the conclusion cannot be drawn."

Discussion section was summarized and updated in order to improve the manuscript, also readers could understand better the purpose of the detection of PIK3CA mutation in non-metastatic TNBC. Moreover, conclusion was reviewed and drawn: "The detection of PIK3CA mutation in TNBC after neoadjuvant treatment and surgery might be associated with an early relapse or rapid disease progression. Detection of PIK3CA mutations may help identify patients at high risk of distant metastases..."

2. "The authors should indicate the findings with arrows in Figure 1."

Arrows were added in Figure 1.

3. "Non-native speakers of English editing certificate was not uploaded appropriately."

Non-native speakers of English editing certificate is included appropriately (submitted online).

Science editor (Ya-Juan Ma)

1. "Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors reported a case with a triple-negative breast cancer, in which a PIK3CA mutation was detected. However, the questions raised by the reviewer should be answered"

All the questions raised by peer-reviewed have been answered.

2. "Issues raised: The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words".

Title was modified to be no more than 18 words, also the words "case report" were included in the new version (total 16 words).

3. "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".

A PowerPoint presentation was prepared and submitted online (including original pictures) in order to be analyzed or reprocessed by the editor.

4. 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.

PMID and DOI numbers were added in the reference list. In addition, all authors of the references were cited. It is important to mention that "discussion section" was summarized and reviewed as a suggestion of first peer-reviewer author (list count is reduced).

5. "The "Case Presentation" section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision".

"Case Presentation" section was correctly rewritten according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision ("final diagnosis", "treatment" and "outcome and follow-up" sections were corrected).

Science editor; Peer Reviewer; Company Editor-in-Chief (Lian-Sheng Ma)

1. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

Notes in illustrations or figures were reviewed and corrected using the uniform criteria explained in “Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation and Submission: Case Report.”