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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is well written, treats an actual problem and provides evidence about a case diagnosed with cutaneous breast cancer metastases, which received several different treatments using needle biopsy guidance, and which eventually acquired a relatively long survival time. The article suggests that most skin lesions, with or without soft tissue infiltration, are not easily manageable with local modalities, such as surgery and/or radiation therapy, because skin infiltration is more likely a manifestation of systemic relapse. Therefore, therapeutic strategies should be based on the control of systemic disease, rather than local modalities, even for patients with only skin lesions. Case report: The clinical case presentation is comprehensive and detailed but there are some mayor points that should be clarified: Mayor points: Final diagnosis and Discussion Mention the experience of each puncture biopsy with this type of procedure, the number of procedures performed before the study). Also mention and emphasize the mean duration and histological change of the high expression of ER (+), PR (+) and Ki-67 (40%), and the low expression of Her-2 (-). The third subcutaneous nodule puncture biopsy, and the following immunostaining results were obtained: The triple negative expression of ER (-), PR (-) and Her-2 (-), and the high expression of Ki-67 (60 %); ER (10%) and PR (-), HER-2 (-) and Ki-67 (80%) (Fig. 3C). ; Include in the discussion to give readers an idea of clinical application and practicality, even though it is mentioned and highlighted in the conclusions. Study and treatment limitations were not mentioned. Also, mention how your results compare to another study that was published very recently. The review is not very detailed or up-to-date. Critical issues in this document were not addressed.

Minor Comments Ability to identify strengths and weaknesses of the study. Although
it raised important questions about the validity of the study, the review is silent. On the robustness of the study, or if the research question was important and if the case study was original. Constructiveness of comment