

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 75681

Title: iCEMIGE: Integration of CEll-morphometrics, MIcrobiome, and GEne biomarker

signatures for risk stratification in breast cancers

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05868418

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-10 07:25

Reviewer performed review: 2022-02-11 01:29

Review time: 18 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. "we designed a strategy to integrate multimodal data and investigated whether iCEMIGE improves risk stratification of breast cancer (BC) patients". maybe your team had compared with other methods, accuracy of the new strategy? 2.why said "MRI is more likely (without guarantee) to mine model-specific representation with independent clinical value via a step-wise mechanism", evidence? 3. If used in breast cancer patient, how long need each assessment? How much need each time? if you could used this method in patients, how many years your team would detect for each patent, maybe 5y, 10y?



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 75681

Title: iCEMIGE: Integration of CEll-morphometrics, MIcrobiome, and GEne biomarker

signatures for risk stratification in breast cancers

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05771662

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-16 00:41

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-04 01:42

Review time: 16 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] 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	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic selection is novel and innovative, 2. The content is substantial, the pictures are rich, and the results are more reliable 3. Can the three indicators observed in the article (CEll-morphometrics, MIcrobiome, and GEne biomarker signatures) be explained.
 Whether it can be combined with the molecular typing of breast cancer for further hierarchical analysis. The introduction of molecular typing of breast cancer is the basis for its diagnosis and treatment in breast cancer.