



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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Authors state "ADAM 17 was independent", the expression "independent" should be reserved for an independent prognostic value, obtained by multivariate statistical analysis and included in prognostic survival studies (by cox regression analysis). The use of such expression in another context is confusing. Authors should follow the usual description "...Present results show that ADAM 17 did not present a statistical significant relationship with age, ..." Moreover authors should include p values in table 1 in order to clarify their results. Regarding association of ADAM expression with grade and other histopathological variables (except for lymph node status), authors should present association only among node negative cases as this is the major goal of present work. The lack of such clarification could induce erroneous conclusion by the readers. Discussion should be altered in agreement of the new presentation of the results. Conclusions are too ambitious having into account the results achieved by authors. Authors are invited to be more objectives and getting conclusions in consonance with their results.	Our current work specifically is centred on whether ADA17 expression depends on the conventional prognostic factors. However, we have plans to take further studies where we will be able to work on survival analysis. Please the P values have been provided in Table 1. Though we were dealing with only node negative, we decided to include node-positive too to determine the expression level of ADAM17. Discussion modified as well The conclusion also modified to do away with any ambiguity. Thank you
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		