

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 69815

**Title:** Severe tinnitus and migraine headache in a 37-year-old woman treated with trastuzumab for breast cancer: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05487696

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Consultant Physician-Scientist, Doctor, Lecturer

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-27 05:44

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-27 07:28

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article presents an interesting case of a rare side effect of the commonly used drug in breast cancer therapy. Title: 1) Not clear enough, I recommend (Severe tinnitus and migraine headache in a 37-year-old woman treated with trastuzumab for breast cancer) ABSTRACT 2) Case summary: "A 37-year-old young " no need for the word (young). CASE PRESENTATION 3) "A 37-year-old Chinese young woman was diagnosed with hormone receptor-positive and HER2-positive invasive ductal cancer in her left breast" Replace by: (A 37-year-old Chinese woman was diagnosed as hormone receptor-positive and HER2-positive infiltrating duct carcinoma in her left breast). 4) History of past illness: What about ENT past history and history of migraine? 5) Physical examination: what you mentioned here is confusing 6) You can exclude physical laboratory and imaging examination sections and replace this by the gross features under the section of diagnosis. No significance of describing those examination features before surgery. 7) Treatment: " No other abnormalities were observed": what does it mean? DISCUSSION 8) "The first case was reported in 2003 by Keiichiro Tada et al" Remove "Keiichiro" and the same for Frank G. van Rooij et al. 9) Try to discuss the "tinnitus and migraine" coming together in other conditions other than adverse reactions of trastuzumab, because yet little is known on how headaches impact tinnitus but some literatures studied this relationship. Conclusion 10) "It reminds us to the awareness of adverse reactions" complete the sentence (eg. adverse reactions of the breast cancer drugs"

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 69815

**Title:** Severe tinnitus and migraine headache in a 37-year-old woman treated with trastuzumab for breast cancer: A case report

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05689407

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Postdoc

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-27 07:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-08-07 11:35

**Review time:** 11 Days and 4 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title reflect the main subject of the manuscript. Abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. Background adequately describe the manuscript, present status and significance of the study. The manuscript describe the clinical case in adequate detail. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately, concisely, clearly, logically and appropriately, being conscient of its limitations (only one case studied) The findings and their applicability or relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. Discussion is accurate and sufficient to explain the scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice. The manuscript does not need biostatistics of use of SI units. The references are cited appropriately, but the most recent reference is from 2014, 7 years ago, and the others are from 2009 and more long-standing but not out-of-date so I think it would be better if the manuscript includes some more recent references, but it is not a key point because the references included are important and authoritative. The authors do not self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references. The style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate, and in general, the manuscript is concisely and coherently presented and organized.