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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: New associations or variations in disease processes

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This case report is very good readable and the methods are good described. There was a change of the procedure during the intervention which makes sense.

During Vacuum-assisted breast biopsy difficulties in accessing the microcalcification is not uncommon in subcutaneous distribution. The suggestion of the authors may encourage other institutes to be more bravely. However, not every institution can hold a surgery online to change the procedure as quickly and I definitively do not agree with the authors that VABB might serve as an alternative way to localize subcutaneous microcalcifications. VABB has not been approved for that topic, whereas localization with a hook-wire is approved and needs no incisions and the needle is less big. I am not convinced that an ethic committee would agree to perform a study for that topic than changing completely the procedure can be quite stressful for the patient. VABB also needs more resources. This case may open a good discussion about VABB.

Unfortunately the image quality of the figures presented online does not allow to reproduce the BIRADS classification.
What next?: Accept

Quality of written English: Acceptable