

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 70784

Title: Efficacy and prognostic factors of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for triple-negative breast cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06075041

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-28 01:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-06 10:37

Review time: 8 Days and 8 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

TNBC has high morbidity and its incidence accounts for approximately one-fifth of the incidence of breast cancer. Due to the lack of effective targeted endocrine therapy, only conventional treatment can be provided in clinical practice. However, the curative effect of conventional treatment is poor, and its local recurrence rate is high, which has become one of the areas of interest in breast cancer studies in recent years. In this retrospective study, Tianyi Dong et al. explored and discussed the effects and prognostic factors of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in TNBC. They found that neoadjuvant chemotherapy for TNBC treatment can achieve good curative effect. Moreover, TNM stage, differentiation degree, lymph node metastasis, KPNA2 and SOX2 expressions, and treatment plan are the prognostic factors of patients with TNBC. The manuscript is well written and very understandable for the reader even if he is not a specialist. Materials and Methods and Discussion are well organized. It is necessary to provide clearer figures again. Figures are not particularly clear. The image resolution must be 300dpi and the authors must use the micrometer μm to avoid the error when publishing the image so that the details are not lost when minimized or enlarged. I recommend accepting this manuscript for publication after a minor editing.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 70784

Title: Efficacy and prognostic factors of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for triple-negative breast cancer

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06074983

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-28 01:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-06 10:38

Review time: 8 Days and 8 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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

I found the manuscript entitled “Efficacy and prognostic factors of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for triple-negative breast cancer” original, very interesting, well-structured and with huge impact on clinical treatments. TNBC have a relatively high recurrence and transfer rates in the operation and 3 years after postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy. Therefore, determining more effective treatments to improve patient prognosis is important. In this study, The therapeutic effect of the 118 patients diagnosed with TNBC was observed, and the survival of patients was followed up. Conclusion was that neoadjuvant chemotherapy for TNBC treatment can achieve good curative effect., which provides a potential and effective strategy for the treatment of TNBC. Comments/suggestions: 1. Title and key words - well chosen. 2-The abstract summarized and reflect the described in the manuscript. 3. Introduction contains the most important data to support the importance of the study. 4. Material and methods - the paragraphs are generally well structured and explained. 5. Results section is clearly presented with pertinent statistics. However, some of the results are too simple. 6. Discussion paragraph is well and underlined the clinical application of this study and the potential limitations. Also, directions for future research were discussed. 7. Good quality of the Figures and Tables. 8. References –appropriate, latest and important.