

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

ESPS manuscript NO: 26720

Title: Sorafenib in breast cancer treatment: A systematic review and overview of clinical trials

I) Reviewer's code: 00729478

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: Very well written.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you

II) Reviewer's code: 00742249

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: The current role of Sorafenib in breast cancer treatment is assessed in this manuscript. A systematic review of the literature yielded 21 relevant clinical trials; 18 and 3 studies involved patients with advanced and early breast cancer, respectively. The authors claim that sorafenib should not be used for the treatment of breast cancer outside of clinical trials and more clinical data are needed in order to support its standard use in breast cancer therapy. This manuscript provides useful information to the medical students, clinicians, and researchers in this field, therefore, is acceptable for publication in World Journal of Clinical Oncology. That is all.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you

III) Reviewer's code: 00742250

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: This is an excellent review article. There is no problem.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

IV) Reviewer's code: 00742221

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: Very original and well conducted experimental study.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

V) Reviewer's code: 00742054

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS: I have included my main comments on the paper. Please see the attached! My other comments: 1. the Introduction section is rather short and lacks enough background information about the disease, why using Sorafenib, the medication mechanism of action and chemistry. 2. the results section should include the reports on previous research. 3. You need to add another section entitled "Discussion" and discuss why different studies reported different results. How discrepancies can be explained? gaps in the literature? recommendation for future research?

AUTHORS' RESPONSE:

Responses to comments numbered 1, 2 and 3:

1. The Introduction section includes now more background information. Two more articles have been cited here, and as a result the numbers of references throughout the remainder of the text have been changed.

2. The Results section includes reports on previous research.

3. In the Discussion section different results between studies, discrepancies, gaps in the literature and future perspectives have been discussed.

Responses to “comments included on the paper”:

1) Comment MK1: The aim and methodology are not considered as core tip. You need to highlight the findings of the study as core tip. Please remove the first two sentences.

Response: The first two sentences have been deleted. A new introductory sentence has been added in order to help readers to get into the subject.

2) Comment MK2: This section is not the “Results”. Indeed, it is part of the “Methods” section. Please remove the “Results” title and add the section to “Methods”.

Response: In fact, this is the Results section, presenting the results of the literature search; this was clear to the other four reviewers, who did not have any objections.

3) Comment MK3: This section is a combination of “Results and “Discussion”. I suggest that you divide it into two sections: “Results and “Discussion”, and then add relevant information to each section.

Response: In fact, this is the Discussion section, in which different results between studies, discrepancies, gaps in the literature and future perspectives are discussed; this was clear to the other four reviewers, who did not have any objections.

4) Comment MK4: Since the purpose of a Systematic Review is to investigate the reports of previous research on a selected issue, you should not cite an unfinished research in your systematic review. Please remove this sentence and delete the Reference 15 from your reference list.

Response: In fact, this is a systematic review of published studies and an overview of ongoing clinical trials. This was clear to the other four reviewers, who did not have any objections. Furthermore, ongoing clinical trials will provide results in the future, as this reviewer requested above (in initial comment 3); it is very important for readers to be informed about future perspectives in the field.

5) Comment MK5: The author mentions that the research by Baselga and co-workers resulted in another research by the same researchers. If the study has been finished and results have been reported, please mention their results here. If the study is unfinished, please remove this paragraph and delete the reference 18 from your reference list as no results are available.

Response: The study is ongoing and this information has been added in this paragraph.

6) Comment MK6: Please delete, as mentioned earlier.

Response: Ongoing research and future perspectives are discussed here (please see also response to Comment MK4).

7) Comment MK7: Please delete.

Response: Ongoing research and future perspectives are discussed here (please see also response to Comment MK4).

8) Comment MK8: You need to write about previous research on this topic. Fowling sentences are talking about studies that have not been finalised yet. So there is no point in citing them here. If you can find relevant studies, please review their results. Otherwise, please delete this sentence.

Response: Ongoing research and future perspectives are discussed here (please see also response to Comment MK4).

9) Comment MK9: Please delete as there is no reports from these studies to discuss about.

Response: Ongoing research and future perspectives are discussed here (please see also response to Comment MK4).

Changes in response to reviewers' comments have been highlighted in the text.