



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11200

Title: Biomarkers in triple negative breast cancer: A review

Reviewer's code: 00504611

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-05-09 18:51

Date reviewed: 2014-06-20 22:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a good review on triple negative breast cancer and well written. There are a number of minor suggestions which are shown on a copy with tracked changes. The only specific was that in the last few sections (COX2, Tyrosine kinases and mTOR) there were no mentions of TNBC and indeed the comments were more based around HER2-positive breast cancer. These sections should either include some specific comments about TNBC or should be removed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 11200

Title: Biomarkers in triple negative breast cancer: A review

Reviewer's code: 00504391

Reviewer's country: Mexico

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-05-09 18:51

Date reviewed: 2014-06-27 11:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Yadav et al. show an interesting review on biomarkers of a very malignant tumor, namely, the triple negative breast cancer. With no doubt, the topic is of high interest to the readers. However, the presentation should be improved to make the review acceptable. Major comments: 1. The manuscript looks only like a compilation of information. At least some suggestions on how to improve diagnosis and therapy of this type of tumor are expected. The authors should make some suggestions on these topics. 2. At least two more figures should be included. The first new figure should summarize the association of biomarkers with diagnosis. The second one should provide the different intracellular pathways involved in the TNBC phenotype. 3. Definitely, the language should be revised by an expert. Minor comments 1. Authors should make nomenclature homogeneous: p53 instead of p 53; Ki67 instead of Ki 67, etc. Please check throughout the text.