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Reviewer's report:

This study is well organized and written with supporting evidence from previous works. These authors provided preclinical evidence that NKTR-102 allows a higher concentration in brain, prolongs its active metabolite SN38 exposure, and may improve treatment outcome in patients with BMBC. However, minor weakness in describing the article is noted.

1. Results of Abstract: From line 61-63 in Page 2, NKTR-102 was compared with vehicle treatment in terms of reduction tumor burden and metastatic sizes. I recommend that this might be compared with irinotecan, conventionally used in practice, even if the absolute numerical difference between NKTR-102 and irinotecan was not larger than the number of between NKTR-102 and vehicle.

2. Last part of Discussion: From line 379 to 381 in page 16, this sentence is awkward in grammar. The phrase “translates to the clinical setting” needed to be revised, such as “translates to the efficacy of the clinical setting”.

3. In page 16, too large part of conclusion was allocated for supporting the BEACON study. Particularly, the sentence of line 391 is not suited for the paragraph of conclusion. The details supporting BEACON study might be moved in to the last part of discussion. As like the conclusion of abstract, the comment of BEACON study should be summarized in single sentence.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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