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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the changes made are adequate.

Minor: I would suggest introducing the RCC acronym in the main body of the text (Background) and use it consistently throughout the paper.

There are several remaining grammatical errors that should be fixed before publication (see suggestions below).

Abstract:

Consider the following grammatical changes:

We report a case of a 68-year-old man with metastasis to a metatarsal bone…

After reviewing the medical records, we found that this patient had a history of…

These findings confirmed the patient had a metatarsal metastasis from…

Clinicians should fully understand the patient's past medical history, especially in the case of foot swelling and pain in male patients with a history of clear cell renal cell carcinoma. The possibility of a foot bone metastasis should always be considered.

Keywords: foot bone

Background:

Consider the following grammatical changes:

Line 36/37: …such as the spine and pelvis.

Line 38/39: Bone metastasis of the foot…
Case Presentation:

Consider the following grammatical changes:

Line 55-59: The patient had a history of a mild right foot sprain that caused pain a year ago. Initially, the pain was relieved after rest, but progressed with worsening pain and swelling after daily activities.

Line 2-3: …the patient's right foot was continuously swollen with worsening, severe pain that limited ambulation.

Line 15: …suspicious for underlying malignancy.

Line 20: After reviewing the medical history, we discovered that the patient had a history of a large left renal mass, discovered in April of 2017.

Line 29: Subsequently, work-up was negative for metastatic disease and a radical nephrectomy was performed.

Line 39: Therefore, in the context of a known primary renal cell carcinoma, a metatarsal metastasis was suspected.

Discussion and Conclusion:

Consider the following grammatical changes:

Line 47: During the 1-year period, the patient developed intermittent swelling…

Line 51: Diagnostic delay may lead to pathological fractures; therefore, metastatic bone disease of the foot…

Line 28: …using radiotherapy…

Line 59: Even though acrometastasis is rare, this diagnosis should be considered in any patient with a history of RCC, particularly male patients, with local pain and swelling. Appropriate clinical and radiographic evaluation of these patients is essential in order to offer timely local therapy that may improve prognosis and enhance patient quality of life.
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