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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   Yes/No

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.
   Comments:

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   Yes/No

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.
   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   b. The relevant physical examination findings

   c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

   d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
      - Diagnostic methods
      - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
      - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

   e. Types and mechanism of intervention

   f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
Comments:
5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
Comments:

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
Yes/No

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments:

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments:

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Comments about: Reconstruction of a dorsal thoracic wall defect by the dorsal intercostal artery perforator flap after removal of a bulky cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma.

Page: 1
In the abstract: in the sentence "The clinical use of perforator flaps has been demonstrated useful in this indications", please chose between singular or plural: this indication or these indications. In the sentence "88 yo women" please replace women with woman. The following sentence is not very clear: "The tumor was classified as T3 and presented a high risk of recurrence indicating a postoperative adjuvant radiotherapy". Reading the manuscript, the reviewer found that, indeed, this is a recurrent lesion, and the authors stated a little later in the paragraph that the patient underwent radiation therapy. "The postoperative outcomes were easy" probably meant that "the patient did not have post-operative complications", then you may state it. "performed on" could be replaced by "started" ten weeks after surgery.

Page 3:
The author stated "Perforator flaps allow a skin reconstruction method", may be skin could be replaced by a term more inclusive than skin, tissue may be? Same sentence: "...that reduces morbidity of the donor site and its harvesting can be adapted according to the extent of the cutaneous defect", please read in red the reviewer suggested corrections. The author wrote:"We are postponing the coverage of a major loss of dorsal substance by a perforating flap that is not yet widely used". The use of "postponing" in this sentence is not very clear. The author wrote:" measuring 10 cm of the major axis", this could be replaced by measuring 10 cm in its major axis. The sentence "lymph node echography" needs clarification. For whatever reasons, echography in the US means echocardiogram. All other modalities of ultrasonographic evaluations are
"ultrasound". In this case, the author could use "ultrasonographic evaluation of the lymph nodes". In addition, the authors could name the lymphatiques chains studied.

Page 4:
In the sentence:" A transitional venous aspect was observed immediately", does the author mean venous congestion?
In the sentence:" with two restricted disruption of sutures", does the author use restricted as a way to indicated a limited disruption of the suture line?

Page 5:
" We shared this case because this promising flap is still little used because it is not well known, but it is a reliable flap that allows the surrounding tissues to be saved". Under-used or under-utilized could replace still little used. Please explain how this specific flap surrounding allows tissue to be saved.
In the sentence:" high patient's age", high may not be necessary to add, but it might be interesting to explain why her age limits her therapeutic options.
Could the author explain: 'and of the previous therapeutic break"?

Page 6:
The sentence:" disease in the underlying bone tissues." needs some clarification. Were the bones, scapula presumably, exposed? Or does it encompass the sub-fascial muscles too?
"Its clinical uses are" please chose singular or plural.
"and its easy execution for a trained surgeon", easy may not be the adjective to use in this case.
These flaps are routine for a limited number of surgeons, only, not for everyone. Please use an adjective that may reflect your high skills and of course training.
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