

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73865

Title: Metaplastic Breast Cancer with Chondrosarcomatous Differentiation Combined

with Concurrent Bilateral Breast Cancer: A Case Report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05194763 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MSc

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

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

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-07 11:14

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-17 17:56

**Review time:** 10 Days and 6 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes [ ]No



## **Baishideng** Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript by Siyuan Yang et al reports the case of a patient affected by metaplastic breast cancer, a rare breast cancer subtype herein presented with a chondrosarcomatous differentiation, combined with concurrent bilateral breast cancer. This case can be considered extremely rare. The patient was treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy after which both the masses partially responded. The left mass showed a chondrosarcoma component which was not detected using needle biopsy, reason why the patient was treated with neoadjuvant therapy and treated as a non-metaplastic breast cancer. The patient was then subjected to adjuvant therapy with good results. In the discussion the authors treat about the rarity of this case and talk about the heterogeneity-related issues and the concerns associated with the possibility for core needle-biopsy to give non-representative information of the whole tumor, as for this case. Considered the rarity of metaplastic breast cancer, this manuscript has the potential to give a little contribution to the literature about this disease. However, I think that the manuscript needs some work to make it more readable. Ambiguities should be solved. Major comments: - Lines 147-165: this part of the discussion is very confusing. I think that a re-read should make it more readable. For instance, what do the authors mean for "Waveform proteins"? The research on PubMed for this temr did not bring any results, can the authors please clarify? What do the authors mean with "chemotactic component" and "chemogenic component"? Please clarify. -Abstract reports: "Following this, the patient was switched to continuous treatment with endocrine therapy using letrozole + goserelin, and the patient is currently in stable condition. "whereas discussion reports "The patient is expected to take capecitabine for 6 months, after which, she will be



# Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

treated with letrozole + goserelin for endocrine therapy. " It is not clear if the patient has -In the abstract: already started this therapy or if she is going to. Please clarify. "Postoperative pathology suggested carcinosarcoma with predominantly chondrosarcoma in the left breast (triple-negative cancer component)" and in the manuscript (lines 107-108): "immunohistochemical findings of ER (-), PR (+, 5%), Ki-67 (+, 70%) for invasive ductal carcinoma". Please clarify. -In the discussion the authors say that needle biopsy can fail to provide complete information also due to the heterogeneity in cell population. Do they think that, in case of unoperable tumor, there could be other tools for unravel this issue? A sentence concerning this concept could be important. -The quality of figures 3,4,5,7 is poor and a scale is lacking. Minor: -Line 103: MRI is reported twice. -Please ensure that full name are reported eavery time an abbreviation is used, and ensure that abbreviations are always used along the next (for example line 163: "metaplastic breast cancer" should be "MPC").



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73865

Title: Metaplastic Breast Cancer with Chondrosarcomatous Differentiation Combined

with Concurrent Bilateral Breast Cancer: A Case Report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04135931 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-06

**Reviewer chosen by:** Qi-Gu Yao (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-17 05:54

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-17 11:33

**Review time:** 5 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes [ ]No



# Baishideng Publishing Baishideng

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

Peer-reviewer

Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous

statements Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

#### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is a case report about a left sided metaplastic breast cancer and synchronous right sided invasive ductal cancer. It is a rare case presented and the author gives a discussion and review about the literature on this subject. It is well written, interesting because of being rare and can be published in my opinion.



#### RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73865

Title: Metaplastic Breast Cancer with Chondrosarcomatous Differentiation Combined

with Concurrent Bilateral Breast Cancer: A Case Report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05194763 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MSc

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

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

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-06

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ru Fan

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-03 12:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-04 13:00

**Review time:** 1 Day

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous



statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors adequately addressed all concerns. I have no other comments.