

Pre-Submission Peer Review Report for your manuscript:

Title: Unusual breast metastasis from rectal gastrointestinal stromal tumor: clinical case.

Job Code: RIFIL_1

Dear Author,

Welcome to Editage and thank you for giving us the opportunity to work with you! We have carefully reviewed and evaluated your manuscript. The overall assessment of your manuscript presented in this report, along with detailed problem areas and suggested revisions mentioned in your manuscript, will help you make improvements and reduce chances of journal rejection.

For ease of understanding, this report is divided into the following sections:

SECTION 1	<p>TECHNICAL OVERVIEW</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main areas of focus from the Technical Review Level 1 checks: Assess the originality / novelty of your research, ethical compliance Level 2 checks: Overview of each section of your manuscript, with an indication of the extent of revisions required Level 3 checks: Appraise the language, presentation, and readability of your manuscript
SECTION 2	Recommendations and NEXT STEPS
APPENDIX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAQs Example service pack

We will be happy to provide further clarifications or answer any queries you may have about this report. Also, please let us know if you would like more information about our other services to help you with improving your manuscript (example pack at the end of this document).

We are committed to supporting you throughout your publication journey with the aim of having your manuscript published in the most appropriate journal. If, however, the manuscript was to be rejected (with major revisions that could have been identified through our service), we will rework the assignment at no additional charge.

We look forward to continuing to be your partner in your publication journey towards acceptance!

Best regards,

Editage – Publication Support

Section 1: TECHNICAL OVERVIEW

This study describes an unusual case of GIST that metastasizes to the breast. The findings are interesting and rare but there are some concerns with regards to the manuscript organization.

To improve chances of a positive review by the target journal, we recommend that the authors address the following major comments:

1. The conclusion should discuss the wider implications of the study findings and specify future research avenues
2. The conclusions of the study should be revisited
3. The findings are not appropriately discussed in the context of previous literature
4. The abstract does not clarify the purpose and/or significance of the study
5. The paper cannot be published without the required ethical information
6. The abstract does not clearly describe the main methods, results, and/or conclusions

The following are the most important strengths of the manuscript that the authors must retain through the process of revisions:

1. Clarity of figures
2. Flow of the discussion
3. Comprehensiveness of the introduction

LEVEL 1 CHECKS – Quality of research

REVIEW PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	RATING
<p>Novelty</p> <p><i>Notes: Findings are novel.</i></p>	<p>Does the work add to knowledge already available (original research)?</p>	<p>EXCELLENT</p>
<p>Rationale</p> <p><i>Notes: The study is well rationalized.</i></p>	<p>Is the rationale for the research made credible with appropriate references to both scientific principles and literature review?</p>	<p>EXCELLENT</p>
<p>Ethical Compliance</p> <p><i>Notes: Consent was obtained. However, ethics/IRB approval for publishing the study is required by some journals, given the involvement of a human subject.</i></p>	<p>Does the research meet standard good practice guidelines for journals to ensure that ethical and responsible research is published, and that all necessary consents and approvals have been obtained from authors to publish their work?</p>	<p>GOOD</p>

LEVEL 2 CHECKS – Manuscript structure

REVIEW QUESTION	RATING	EXTENT OF REVISIONS REQUIRED
<p>Are the study HYPOTHESIS & OBJECTIVES clear, specific and testable?</p> <p><i>Notes: Objective was clearly communicated.</i></p>	EXCELLENT	MINIMAL
<p>Is the STUDY DESIGN sound and appropriate to answer the research questions?</p> <p><i>Notes: Case report was well described.</i></p>	EXCELLENT	MINIMAL
<p>Are the RESULTS clearly stated and presented in text, tables and figures?</p> <p><i>Notes: Please consider some reorganization of the case.</i></p>	GOOD	MINOR
<p>Is the DISCUSSION precise, interprets findings, compares existing research, and shows value addition?</p> <p><i>Notes: Please consider some reorganization of the discussion.</i></p>	GOOD	MINOR
<p>Do the CONCLUSIONS highlight the importance of findings, state limitations, and suggest future direction?</p> <p><i>Notes: Please provide a formal conclusion.</i></p>	FAIR	CONSIDERABLE
<p>Is the CITED LITERATURE relevant, selective, recent and sufficient?</p> <p><i>Notes: Please reduce the number of references.</i></p>	GOOD	MINOR

LEVEL 3 CHECKS – Language, flow and formatting*

REVIEW PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	EXTENT OF REVISIONS REQUIRED
Language & Presentation	Spellings and grammar, effectiveness of sentence construction, organization within paragraphs	MINIMAL
Formatting & Citation	Accurate formatting and citation of text, tables, figures, and references	CONSIDERABLE
Readability & Style	The style of writing communicates the scientific message in a clear and simple manner	MINOR

**Please note that the document has undergone a round of basic editing to improve readability.*

If you would like us to help you with making the revisions highlighted in the Level 3 checks, please check with us about our [Premium Editing Service](#).

Section 2: RECOMMENDATIONS & NEXT STEPS

Detailed comments from the technical expert can be found in the manuscript file. Comments are structured into focus areas and recommended actions.

- **Focus areas** are potential gaps that might be raised by journal peer reviewers
- **Recommended actions** are solutions recommended by our expert to fix these problems. Please follow the recommended actions and make the suggested revisions.

We strongly recommend that you incorporate the suggested revisions. If the suggested revisions are not adequately completed, it is likely that the manuscript may receive a desk rejection once submitted to the target journal.

NEXT STEPS FOR YOU

- Please contact us if you have any queries about the peer review report or if you would like to us any of our other services to assist you in your publication journey.

Please note that there is only one round of technical recheck included with this service (additional rounds of recheck will be chargeable). Please ensure that you make all required revisions and ask for any clarifications, so that the technical expert can check for adequacy and respond to queries before we move to the next step.

We're happy to address any questions you may have on the report.

Thank you for choosing Editage as your publication partner!

Appendix: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS**Q: Who reviews my manuscript? What is the experts' qualification?**

A: Our reviewers have a minimum qualification of a PhD in your relevant subject area and have extensive experience in publishing and peer-reviewing manuscripts. These experts also have experience of writing and publishing their own manuscripts in peer-reviewed journals. Many of our experts even serve as peer reviewers on journal editorial boards.

Q: Do I have to make ALL the changes suggested by the reviewer in the report and the manuscript?

A: We highly recommend that you review and address all the focus areas and recommendations for improvements that we have suggested. These will help with improving the scientific rigor of your manuscript.

Q: I do not fully understand / agree with some of the reviewer comments

A: Please respond in the 'comments' box with your queries about focus areas or recommendations for improvement. The reviewer will respond to these in the free round of review after you have addressed all requests for changes/revisions.

Q: Will you make revisions / correct the areas flagged by your reviewers?

A: No, we will not make any changes to the manuscript. We will provide suggestions for improvement of your manuscript by highlighting gaps in scientific content (similar to a journal peer reviewer). We will review the changes you have made and give you further comments, as needed.

If you are based in Japan, we will be happy to make revisions for you (at an additional cost). You will be required to provide us the factual information necessary to make revisions.

Q: Do you guarantee publication?

A: Publication depends largely on the quality of your research and is a subjective decision that the journal editor takes based on several factors. Therefore, we cannot guarantee publication. However, by helping you understand and follow publication protocols, and by improving the technical content and presentation of your manuscript through services like the Rapid Technical Review and Premium Editing service, we help you increase your chances of publication.

Q: Is there post service support?

A: You can make revisions and send the manuscript back to the expert for one round of free review. Please make ALL revisions possible before sending back the manuscript, so that the review of the revised manuscript will be more effective.

Appendix: OTHER SERVICE OFFERINGS - Example pack with timelines*

This is an example of a publication support ‘pack’ that includes services to help improve scientific content and check for overlapping text, recommending appropriate journals, editing and formatting the manuscript, and submitting the manuscript to the selected target journal. You can choose to use these and many other services (including statistical check, statistical analysis, literature review, graphical abstract, etc.) as you see fit for your manuscript. We will be happy to customize a pack/service to your needs!

