

Review of: "Effect of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and vitamin D3 levels on the pathological complete response after neoadjuvant treatment in TNBC and HER2-positive early breast cancer – results of a prospective study"

J.S. Aprioku¹

¹ University of Port Harcourt

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript which is entitled, "Effect of neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and vitamin D3 levels on the pathological complete response after neoadjuvant treatment in TNBC and HER2-positive early breast cancer – results of a prospective study" (Qeios ID: HTU980).

Authors evaluated the possibility of using neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio as useful tool for predicting neoadjuvant treatment outcome in triple negative and HER-2 early state breast cancer patients. The concept is very interesting and the article is well written with much competence. The methods adopted are very appropriate, and the results are properly described and discussed logically. The article is well organized with a good flow and ended with an apt conclusion. I recommend publication of the paper after effecting some minor corrections.

My comments for the authors are below:

Authors evaluated the possibility of using neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio as useful tool for predicting neoadjuvant treatment outcome in triple negative and HER-2 early state breast cancer patients. The concept is very interesting and the article is properly organized and well written with clarity. However, I have suggested the following minor corrections:

Abstract

1. There may be need to include findings on vitamin D3 in result and conclusion statements in the abstract with regards to the title of the study.

Introduction

2. Page 2, Last paragraph, Line 1: 'Chae suggests in her study...' the year of publication should be added in parenthesis.

Results

Page 5, Table 1.

3. Variables should be properly placed against their values to avoid confusion
4. Include SD values for age and BMI for TNBC patients.
5. Neutrophil is duplicated and lymphocyte is not included in the table. Check table and clarify

Define abbreviations as done for NLR. Define RCB.

Page 6

6. Line 2: Change: '...mean age 47.16 years)...' To: '...mean age 47.16 years for the HER2-positive group)...
7. Line 3: Change: '...4.91 and 1.7...' To: '...4.91 and 1.7 g/dL ...'
8. Line 5: Change: '...cancer group, respectively' To: '...cancer group.'
9. Line 5: Unit for D3 stated in text (ng/mL) is not same with unit in table (IU).
10. Line 11: Change: '...For non-PCR patients' To: '...For non-pCR patients.'
11. Explanation of results should be followed by citation of the appropriate table(s) to guide the reader. This is the standard practice.

Page 7

11. Table 2. Lymphocyte is not in the table, but neutrophil is duplicated. Also check unit of neutrophil indicated in the table.

Discussion

12. Abbreviations of DFS, OS, ANC, ROC, TILS should be defined the first time they are used in this section.
13. Page 11, paragraph 1, Line 2. Change: '..tumour progression by progression by regulating...' To: '...tumour progression by regulating...'
14. Page 12, paragraph 3, Line 2. Change: '..related to population vitamin D...' To: '...related to population, vitamin D...'