

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26596

Title: Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes in triple negative breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy

Reviewer's code: 02460553

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:23

Date reviewed: 2016-05-16 15:05

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 type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The aim of this study was to determine influence of pre- and post- Neoadjuvant-Chemotherapy (NAC) over Tumor-Infiltrating-Lymphocytes (TIL) in Triple-Negative-Breast-Cancer. The author found some interesting results, like significant associations of TIL with CR and outcomes only in pre-NAC but not post-NAC; however, I have some concerns about this study. 1) The exact inclusion criteria to the cohort, the source(s) of information needed to identify the cohort should be clearly explained. Then explain how the chosen sample size was decided. 2) How the authors calculated the power of this study? This study seems not to have enough power to detect significant associations due to small sample size, so the significant results seen in the study may purely be due to chance. 3) All the results were unadjusted for potential covariates, what are results with adjustment for confounders, normally the covariates have to be adjusted for genetic studies, such as age, sex, other parameters related to your outcomes. 4) The authors should apply a Bonferroni Correction for their analyses. There are at least 4 comparisons for each group (Table 4 and 5). As you know, the more comparisons one performs the more likely they will find differences due to chance.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26596

Title: Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes in triple negative breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy

Reviewer's code: 00729478

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:23

Date reviewed: 2016-05-19 13:44

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting ,well written

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26596

Title: Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes in triple negative breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy

Reviewer's code: 00742121

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:23

Date reviewed: 2016-05-22 19:27

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors should clearly present and discuss those findings in their study, which are original and novel to the field. In particular, the authors mention that Denkert et al. evaluated 1,000 breast cancer samples, whereas in this paper they evaluated <100; hence, how original is this work and what new evidence does this study bring to the field? The authors can find all other comments in the manuscript file attached. In particular, the paper should be reviewed by an expert in English and the title should be revised in order to convey the findings of the study.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26596

Title: Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes in triple negative breast cancer receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy

Reviewer's code: 00742250

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2016-04-18 17:23

Date reviewed: 2016-05-23 06:47

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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		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 an interesting study and has a value of publication. Before that, the authors should respond to the reviewer's question. Did the authors count absolute stained cells by CD3, CD4, CD8 and FOXP3 in tumor cells? If so, please clarify the description in the text. Why did the authors use FOXP3 in the study? The reason should be clarify in the text.