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Reviewer’s report:

General

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I like to complement the authors with this piece of work. The message is very important and I hope it will contribute to improve the quality of care for patients with breast cancer.
I have two problems with this study.
The first is that the website the authors refer to, is not available. It is difficult to get a good picture of the data in the selected studies without access to this website.
The second is that I miss examples and illustrations in the result section, to make the results more accessible to readers being not involved in the study. Adding examples/illustrations might help the reader to get grip on the material selected from literature.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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