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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this article in which the authors analyse the configuration of the pectoralis muscle flaps in sternoclavicular defects, providing a literature review and a new classification of the surgical procedure as well.

The subject of this paper is interesting and represent often a challenge for the surgeon who need to provide reconstruction without compromising much the function of the pectoralis region. The article is well written and the research is well performed following the guidelines.

Some small revisions are required to improve the manuscript quality:

The abstract provides a good description of paper although the conclusion section should be improved providing more support to the research.

Introduction paragraph: line 40 need reference.

Please include a small paragraph reporting the other available possibilities for reconstruction (LD Flap, Trapezius Flap, Free Flap) discussing briefly pros and cons compared with pectoralis flap.

Results paragraph: the flap characteristics are at the base of the proposed classification therefore a more detailed description of each flaps variant should be reported.

Conclusions should support more the utility of this classification.

Reference: the list is complete and no important articles have been excluded.

Table: the table 1 well summarises the classification.

Figure 2: The vascular anatomy should be better described providing details on each branch.
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