

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Research Journal of Oncology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IRJO_121450</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Tucatinib: A Breakthrough in Advanced Breast Cancer Therapy</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive evaluation of tucatinib, a breakthrough therapy for HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer. The detailed analysis of the HER2CLIMB trial and the discussion on tucatinib's ability to reduce brain metastases offer valuable insights into its clinical benefits. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on both efficacy and safety, making it a critical resource for oncologists and researchers aiming to optimize treatment strategies for HER2-positive MBC. Additionally, the emphasis on ongoing research and future directions highlights the potential for further advancements in this field.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>ok</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive, effectively summarizing tucatinib's mechanism of action, clinical efficacy, safety profile, and current guidelines for its use in treating HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer (MBC). It also touches on ongoing clinical trials and future research directions, providing a well-rounded overview.</p> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Addition of Specific Trial Outcomes:</b> The abstract could benefit from briefly mentioning the specific statistical improvements in progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) from the HER2CLIMB trial. Including these data points would provide a clearer picture of tucatinib's impact.</li> <li><b>Clarification of Safety Profile:</b> While the abstract mentions common adverse events, it could specify the incidence rates or severity of these side effects to better inform the reader about the drug's tolerability.</li> <li><b>Patient Population:</b> A brief mention of the patient population (e.g., heavily pretreated, with brain metastases) that was included in the HER2CLIMB trial could help contextualize the results and the significance of tucatinib's efficacy.</li> <li><b>Omission of Redundancies:</b> The abstract is generally concise, but if there is a need to trim it down, the phrase "which are essential for tumor cell proliferation and survival" could be omitted as it slightly reiterates the role of the HER2 pathway.</li> </ol> <p>Overall, the abstract is well-written but could be enhanced with more specific details on trial outcomes and a clearer presentation of the drug's safety profile.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>ok</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough analysis of tucatinib's mechanism of action, supported by detailed references to the HER2CLIMB trial, which is a pivotal study in this area. The discussion of tucatinib's efficacy and safety is grounded in well-established clinical data, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are based on solid evidence. Additionally, the manuscript appropriately integrates current guidelines and ongoing research, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the drug's role in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer treatment. The technical accuracy and the use of up-to-date, peer-reviewed sources further enhance the manuscript's credibility.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	ok	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Thorough checking is needed for minor corrections	
Optional/General comments		

### **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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu Md Ashif Ikbal
Department, University & Country	Assam University, India