



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 49918

Title: Ureteral breast cancer metastasis: A case report

Reviewer's code: 02990500

Reviewer's country: Lebanon

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-24 05:28

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-24 05:40

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The current paper is a case report that described an ureteral metastasis after a eight years that she had a breast cancer. The paper has a certain clinical implication, and well written. Below some few issues that may improve the manuscript prior to publication.

- The title is short and unclear. Should be little bit more descriptive.
- The



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Introduction section is poorly referenced. • The Introduction section should include the aim of the case report. • Please report the date and number of the ethical committee approval.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 49918

Title: Ureteral breast cancer metastasis: A case report

Reviewer’s code: 00503175

Reviewer’s country: Croatia

Science editor: Jin-Lei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-07-25 04:46

Reviewer performed review: 2019-07-28 08:18

Review time: 3 Days and 3 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Article „Ureteral breast cancer metastasis: A case report“ by Zhong-Han Zhou et al. is according to my opinion, acceptable for publication but after revision. The operative treatment of the patient must be better explained. The authors stated: „Then a laparoscopic radical ureterotomy was performed, and the patient was discharged six



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

days after surgery in good condition". But the term ureterotomy mean opening of the ureter. Next in the text authors mentioned that pathologist examined kidney and ureter. So, the authors probably performed laparoscopic nephroureterectomy? Please explain the performed procedure.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No

BPG Search:

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- No