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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Need the images of the case.

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

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

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)?

1. Case summary in Abstract needs to be short and crisp; details can be in the main manuscript.

2. Why FNAC or biopsy not taken from mass ??
   Since it was not done in this case, it must be mentioned as learning point in the discussion and conclusion.

3. A detailed history is very good, however much can be made concise with omission and joining few lines. Use past tense in the summary.

4. No ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) component is seen; I think it's a case of proven invasive ductal carcinoma.

5. What was the time interval after excision for sentinel LN biopsy ?

6. Was assessor breast unilateral or bilateral; if bilateral, what were the findings in right breast and assessor breast. Add comments.
7. Text has no mention of any images nor any image in the file received. Without images, the case loses its sheen and may not be recommended further.

8. Is there any role or status or radical mastectomy of the ipsilateral breast? if nodes are positive and/or negative?

9. Any data on further long term survival of such patients with breast cancer patients may be handy.

10. The manuscript needs language editing.
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