SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JCTI_35955**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Impact of ADAM17 expression as a potential prognostic biomarker and target for therapy in node-negative Breast Carcinoma**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Paper**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	This study evaluate the prognostic impact of the tissue-based protein expression of ADAM17 in node-negative breast cancer. The result shows that the statistics are significant. However, some methods and experimental results in this paper are unclear. Therefore, the Compulsory REVISION comments are listed as follows: (1) In **Introduction**: Please provide more related works about node-negative breast cancer. (2) In **Introduction:** Line 72, authors say that there are few reports of ADAM17…. Because their references only be updated to 2011, we do not know if there are any new researches between 2012 to 2017. (3) In **Materials & Method:** Line 86, please provide the "year" of 50 testing cases. (4) Please provide the flowchart for your proposed therapy in **Materials & Method** section. (5) In **Results**: authors showed Fig. 1 directly, but forgot to explain in Section 3. (6) In **Results**: Table 1, the *p*-value must be listed in each item. (7) In **Discussion**: OK! However, suggest to divide into several sub-sections. (8) In **References:** Most of References are too old; the newest is 2011. (9) **Total:** The descriptions in article is too rough, especially in section 2 and 3. The authors have to add more contents about "Materials & Method" and "Experimental Results".	Comments have been addressed, but proposed therapy is not part of this current work. Thank you
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		