

Review of: "Breast Cancer Subtypes And Prognosis: Answers To Subgroup Classification Questions, Identifying The Worst Subgroup In Our Single-Center Series"

Claudio Fuentes-Sánchez

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Without a doubt, the authors have made a great effort in carrying out the work (number of patients, variables analyzed, tables, figures, etc.) but I would like to make some considerations.

1. In a paper it is not about giving a lot of data, we must transmit clear ideas or our experience focusing on the most outstanding aspects. I think there are too many data in the tables, which are difficult to read, there are many known prognostic factors in breast cancer, reiterating them adds nothing and hides the data of value. The article should focus on a more specific aspect, it should focus on the most striking aspects of the results, such as survival in TNBC is equal to or better than Luminal A and B tumors (?) and try to give an explanation in the discussion or that her2+ has worse survivability than other groups and remove the accessory data, otherwise it becomes very hard to read.

We also have to improve some things like:

- The first time an acronym is used, indicate what it means, for example TMX, TNBC, TN...

When entering figures, the measure must also be entered, for example in the second paragraph of results: "DFS (190.37±7.19 (176.27-204.46) for TNBC, 190.37 is days, months?, 127.27, what is it? If it is the confidence interval, you have to put it CI etc.

and finally I think the wording could be improved.