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Thank you for addressing multiple issues raised by the reviewers.

However, both reviewers felt the paper was too long. The paper does not appear to have been shortened.

In response to my query about why the 7th edition of the AJCC staging manual was used rather than the 8th, the authors added a reference about the 8th edition.

There are several new issues with this. The authors did not use the staging in the 8th edition (which has two pathologic stagings: Anatomic and Pathologic Prognostic), so reference 13 is misleading. The authors should simply explain why they used the 7th edition rather than the newer 8th edition.

Furthermore, Reference 13 is an article about the new staging manual, not the actual manual.

For the record the correct reference for the 8 edition is


And the corrected chapter on breast available as a free online download is:

https://cancerstaging.org/About/news/Pages/Updated-Breast-Chapter-for-8th-Edition.aspx
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