



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56331

Title: JUXTAPAPILLARY CHOROIDAL METASTASIS OF BREAST CARCINOMA: A CASE REPORT

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is.....
- ✓ **Accept after minor revision.....**
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strengths of the Study

- **Originality:** The study reports a rare case of juxtapapillary choroidal metastasis from breast carcinoma, contributing new clinical insights into this uncommon presentation.
- **Relevance:** The case emphasizes the importance of considering metastatic lesions in patients with a history of breast cancer presenting with visual symptoms, guiding clinicians in diagnosis and management.
- **Methodology:** Utilizes comprehensive multimodal imaging including fundus examination, autofluorescence, fluorescein angiography, optical coherence tomography, and ultrasonography which robustly supports the diagnosis.
- **Data Quality:** Clear presentation of clinical findings supplemented by high-quality imaging figures enhances comprehension and diagnostic confidence.
- **Contribution:** Highlights diagnostic challenges and underscores the significance of early detection and multidisciplinary approach to optimize visual outcomes.

Weaknesses of the Study

- **Sample Size:** As a single case report, it lacks generalizability and cannot establish causality or broad clinical recommendations.
- **Literature Context:** Limited discussion comparing this case with existing literature, especially regarding prevalence, management, and outcomes of similar cases.
- **Follow-up Data:** Absence of long-term follow-up results to assess treatment response and visual prognosis.
- **Diagnostic Confirmation:** No histopathological confirmations such as biopsy, which could strengthen the diagnosis, particularly in atypical or uncertain cases.
- **Ethical Considerations:** No statement about obtaining patient consent or ethical approval for publishing identifiable clinical information and images.

Reviewer Comments

- **Title and Abstract:** The title clearly conveys the focus but contains a typographical error in "JUXTAPAPILLARY" (misspelled; should be "juxtapapillary"). The abstract provides a concise summary of the case and highlights key points; however, it could briefly outline the main diagnostic approaches and management outcomes.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Introduction and Objectives:** The introduction offers relevant background on choroidal metastases and their clinical significance. Explicitly stating the objectives, such as detailing the diagnostic process and management challenges of this rare presentation, would enhance clarity.
- **Methodology and Statistical Analysis:** As a case report, the methodology (clinical examination and multimodal imaging) is appropriate. There are no statistical analyses required. Including a brief differential diagnosis discussion and rationale for ruling out other conditions would improve depth.
- **Results and Discussion:** The clinical findings are well described, supported by illustrative images. The discussion contextualizes the rarity of juxtapapillary involvement but should cite more recent or similar cases for comparison and elaborate on potential management strategies.
- **Conclusion and Implications:** The conclusion appropriately emphasizes the importance of early diagnosis and multidisciplinary care but could specify the potential for visual preservation through timely intervention.
- **Ethical Clearance:** The manuscript does not mention obtaining ethical approval or patient consent for publishing, which is essential, especially when releasing identifiable clinical images and data.
- **Language and Grammar:** The manuscript is generally well-written; minor typographical errors, such as the title misspelling, should be corrected. Overall, the language mainly meets academic standards.
- **Figures, Tables, and Formatting:** Figures are relevant and of good quality; the formatting appears consistent. Confirm that all in-text citations are correctly referenced in the full manuscript. Including caption details and referring to figures within the main text would improve flow.

Note: Based on the content, there is no indication that it has been previously published on the internet or in other academic sources. However, to definitively confirm originality and prevent potential plagiarism issues, I recommend running the manuscript through a dedicated plagiarism detection tool or cross-referencing with established medical databases.