

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 64145

Title: The Impact of Community-Based Exercise Program Participation on Aerobic Capacity in Women with and without Breast Cancer

Reviewer's code: 04135204

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-02-10

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-02-18 06:55

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-03 03:34

Review time: 12 Days and 20 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

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, this study provided the potential for the early BCS patients to improve their aerobic capacity through community-based exercise. However, why was the VO₂peak higher in BCS patients than that in controls? The authors should compare their results pre vs post, BCS vs controls in different levels. 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. The benefits of exercise can be got from different studies, but for patients with cancer, how to define the criteria is very important. The current study focused on VO₂peak and investigated its potential to use in such patients. How to extend the use of this criteria in other stage of BCS or in other types of cancers. Importantly, as the survivors did not meet recommended physical activity guidelines, how to improve their compliance? 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? No. The construction and design of the tables were horrible

to illustrate their purposes. Please redesign the tables. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes. 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? No. Too many references. 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? No, some of the writing is too verbose, based on their results. Please do not over-explain. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript 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