



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57298

Title: Primary Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Breast: A Diagnostic Enigma.

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity				✓
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript presents a rare case of primary squamous cell carcinoma (PSCC) of the breast. The topic is relevant and clinically meaningful due to its rarity and diagnostic difficulty. However, the manuscript requires moderate to major revision, mainly due to issues in language, clarity, and depth of discussion.

Strengths

- Rare and clinically relevant case.
- Good correlation between imaging, cytology, histology, and IHC.
- Images (pages 2–3) support the diagnosis effectively.

Major Comments

1. Language and Readability

The manuscript has multiple grammatical errors, inconsistent spacing, and awkward sentence construction. This affects overall clarity and needs thorough language editing.

2. Case Presentation Clarity

The case is generally well described, but the flow can be improved. Some sentences are long and unclear. Better structuring (clinical findings → imaging → cytology → histology → management) is needed.

3. Diagnostic Workup Explanation

The discrepancy between FNAC (benign) and final diagnosis (malignant) is important but not sufficiently analyzed. The authors should explain this limitation more critically.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Histopathology and IHC Details

While key findings are mentioned, interpretation is brief. More explanation of IHC markers (CK5/6, p40) and their diagnostic relevance would strengthen the manuscript.

5. Discussion Depth

The discussion is mostly descriptive and literature-based. It lacks critical insight into:

- What makes this case unique
- Clinical implications of delayed diagnosis (3-year history)
- Practical take-home message for clinicians

Minor Comments

1. Typographical errors and spacing issues are frequent.
2. Some abbreviations are not properly introduced.
3. Figure legends need clearer descriptions and consistent formatting (Figures on pages 2–3).
4. Reference formatting is inconsistent.
5. Repetition is present in the discussion section.