

## Manuscript Title

The Role of Metastasectomy in Women with Solitary Metastatic Breast Cancer Recurrence

## Author(s)

Patrick Mun Yew Chan, Sherwin Kuah, Mui Heng Goh, Sarah Qinghui Lu, Juliana Jia Chuan Chen and Ern Yu Tan\*

Department of General Surgery, Tan Tock Seng Hospital, Singapore

## Summary

*The manuscript was received on October 06, 2017 and was peer reviewed by two reviewers and an editor.*

*The initial recommendation of Accept Pending Minor Revision was made on December 08, 2017.*

*The first revision was submitted on December 22, 2017 and was re-evaluated by the editor.*

*The manuscript was accepted for publication on January 12, 2018.*

## Peer Review Comments

### Peer Reviewer 1:

#### General Comments to Author:

This is a retrospective case series on an interesting topic. Unfortunately, the sample size is too small to generalize any findings. More information about the patients who did not undergo surgery would be helpful.

#### Specific Comments to Author:

The Materials and Methods section contained information about the methods as well as some results. For example, I recommend that in the Methods section, you explain in more detail how you identified the women who developed systemic relapse and the subset who were treated with surgery, and put any description of these women in the Results section.

Out of 322 women with distant recurrence, you describe 13 treated with surgery, and compared them to 216 who received systemic therapy alone. What treatment did the other 93 women receive?

The table is very complete, but the writing is difficult to understand. Patients are sometimes referred to by their number in the table, and sometimes not.

I had some specific questions about Patient 1. Why would she receive chemotherapy with stage I disease? Would curettage for a sternal metastasis really count as 'complete resection'?

This is a retrospective case series with a small sample size. However, this topic is difficult to study in any more rigorous fashion. I would recommend that the authors explain in more detail how they identified the cohort, supply more information about the women who did not undergo surgery, and revise the results section to make it clearer.

Overall, it's a crucial topic and deserves some credit (which in this case needs revision if it is to be considered for publication).

**Peer Reviewer 2:**

Overall, it is a well-written manuscript giving important results (improved survival) contemplating the aggressive management of solitary metastatic breast cancer recurrence. It should be accepted for publication following revision. I'd recommend authors focus a bit more on the sample size and methodology. Moreover, there are some grammatical errors that need to be rectified.