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Reviewer's report:

Although the revised paper shows major improvements, there are several issues that still need to be addressed.

Minor Essential Revisions

In the abstract, replace the sentence “The proliferation rate as measured by Ki67 appeared higher in the lesions analyzed when to comparing normal TDLUs.” with “The proliferation rate as measured by Ki67 appeared higher in the lesions analyzed than in normal TDLUs.”

In the Background section, 2nd paragraph, change “The number of cellular layers enable CCLs to be divided into two broad categories: columnar cell lesions (1-2 cell layers) and columnar cell hyperplasia (>2 cell layers), each further subclassifications of these according to the absence or presence of cytological atypia, collectively known as flat epithelial atypia (FEA)” to “The number of cellular layers enable CCLs to be divided into two broad categories: columnar cell lesions (1-2 cell layers) and columnar cell hyperplasia (>2 cell layers), each further subclassified according to the absence or presence of cytological atypia; columnar lesions with cytological atypia are collectively identified as flat epithelial atypia (FEA)”.

The authors are advised to revise the adopted nomenclature of columnar lesions throughout the manuscript, particularly with regard to columnar cell lesions without atypia (CCLs), which the authors occasionally name CCC (Columnar Cell Change) (ex. Fig 1 legend).

In Material and Methods section, the authors should provide additional information on the columnar cell lesions used for immunohistochemical analysis.

In the Results section (1st paragraph), please correct the sentence “Associated lesions were represented only by ductal and lobular hyperplasias and epithelial neoplastic lesions.

In the Results section (5th and 6th paragraph), replace HCC with CCH.

In the Discussion section (1st and 2nd paragraph), the authors seem to replicate the same idea: “The morphological appearance of the canine CCC was very similar to the human breast.” (1st paragraph) and “The CCLs described in our
study closely resemble CCLs in human specimens.” (2nd paragraph).

The last sentence of the Discussion remains unclear.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.