

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_98658
Title of the Manuscript:	The Case study of brain metastases after neoadjuvant chemotherapy and radiotherapy for adenocarcinoma.
Type of the Article	Case Report

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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Suggested title: A case report of brain metastases after neoadjuvant chemo and radiotherapy for esophagogastric junction adenocarcinoma in an adult male patient</p> <p>3. Reorganize the background of the abstract, write about adenocarcinoma and its metastasis first, then write about neoadjuvant therapy. The last sentence of the case presentation is not clear: The symptoms gradually aggravated without obvious relief withprevious bodybuilding (?)</p> <p>4. ok</p> <p>5. The information is not presented in an organized way and is not discussed sufficiently.</p> <p>6. 12 out of 14 references are very old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs further improvement in sentence construction.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please add 'brain metastasis' in the keyword.</p> <p>Only breast cancer was discussed in the 'Introduction' section. Add info about cancer the patient is suffering from.</p> <p>The first 6 lines of the 'case presentation' after the introduction section are exactly the same as the one in the abstract, need rewording.</p> <p>Line 6 of 'case presentation' after the introduction section 'Previous bodybuilding' is not clear. Provide arrows in the appropriate places and add the figure legends for all the images. Line 3 and 6 in discussion: write the name of the country or the region of the world such as SEA countries or so on instead of 'my country'</p> <p>The discussion section should elaborate on post-neoadjuvant therapy brain metastasis and relate it to the patient.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jesmine Khan
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia