



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_28440
Title of the Manuscript:	SIGNIFICANCE OF TUMOR MARKER CA15-3 IN BONY METASTATIC BREAST CANCER
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Insert topics in the abstract according to the correct format. Insert a picture of better quality (bone scan) - try a print screen. Language review.	Correct Formatting of abstract has been done. Picture of bone scan is removed. Language review has been done.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Although the article does not have an epidemiological objective, it is interesting that the data contained in the discussion (lines 160-165) are updated. The authors cite data from 2012. Update, if possible. It would be interesting that the profile of the sample was exposed in a table containing a quantitative distribution by age, stage of disease, type of treatment, morphological and molecular classification. This type of information is important for the reader to understand the clinical context that their study was developed. The second conclusion is beyond the scope of the study (line 223). To say that the marker CA 15-3 is a significant and sensitive but not specific tumor marker for detection of bone metastasis in breast cancer, the authors need to expose statistical tests for specificity and sensitivity. To evaluate the sensitivity and specificity of the bone scan is not an objective of the study. I suggest entering statistical tests or withdraw such a statement so there is more coherence between objective and conclusion.	Epidemiological data is updated A table containing a quantitative distribution by age, stage of disease has been included. Type of treatment, morphological and molecular classification was not included in the study 2nd conclusion has been cut b/c it was not the objective of study and not proved in our study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Side results should be avoided during the conclusion.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article has a simple and interesting aim. Provides additional information on the molecular study of the breast cancer and strengthens the importance of the tumor markers during the approach to this disease. The following suggestions to improve the scientific quality of the manuscript.	Thanks and regards