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Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have conducted a 'meta-analysis' of the adjuvant trastuzumab trails in early stage breast cancer. I personally remain anxious about the term 'meta-analysis' with respect to this sort of publication. These data do not refer to the source data of each individual trial as per the Oxford overviews but rather are a summary of the data, weighted by trial size. Given the homogeneity of results and the admitted 'appropriate' powering of the majority of the studies, the summary data hold no surprises. The results are therefore perhaps, at best, of moderate interest only.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

For a meta-analysis of efficacy and toxicity, there is too much discussion (in the wrong place) on the pharmacoecomics. No formal assessments have been done and while the fiscal impact is of great importance, this discussion adds little to the paper as a whole.

I remain confused about the subject of 'second no breast cancer ca' the discussion mentions cerebral metastases in this section. Is this what was meant or is there truely a reduction in risk of other cancers (I do not remember this from original publications.

No comment is made about the heterogeneity of the cardiac data and the 2nd sentance on p17 with respect to cardiac toxicity makes no sense.

P8, data are NOT availabe on 2 years of trastuzumab

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

Multiple typos and attention to meaning required

e.g. Page 4 Objectives needs to be rewritten, P5, lines 4 and 5 make little sense, line 11 what is the meaning of SNC? P10, line 12 onwards, makes little sense. Similarly, P11, lines 8 and 9. P14, line 15 Ours results. P15, line 2 rewrite. P17, higher (than control), lines 3 and 4 rewrite. 2nd sentance makes little sense. Line 11 presumably means beta blockade

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 of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests