

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66360

Title: Migration of the localization wire to the back in patient with nonpalpable breast

carcinoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03890335 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: BSc, MD

Professional title: Doctor, Research Fellow, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-07 02:31

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-12 00:23

Review time: 4 Days and 21 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I believe that the authors should analyze the possible reasons and present the verification result in the manuscript.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66360

Title: Migration of the localization wire to the back in patient with nonpalpable breast

carcinoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 05222067 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Chief Physician, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-01 03:18

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-01 05:42

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes. 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No biostatistics was used in this manuscript. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript



https://www.wjgnet.com

type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 66360

Title: Migration of the localization wire to the back in patient with nonpalpable breast

carcinoma: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03538691 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chief Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: South Korea

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-26

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-06-01 14:55

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-04 22:28

Review time: 3 Days and 7 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] 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) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Page 4, last line 9-12 1 【CASE PRESENTATION Chief complaints A 48-year-old woman visited the clinic for an ultrasonographic abnormality detected on a routine check-up. 】 Lack of hospital ethics proof Page 4 ,last line 2-3 2 【The patient was diagnosed with invasive ductal carcinoma following an ultrasound (USG) core needle biopsy. 】 Lack of pathological pictures of the core needle biopsy.