

Peer Review File

<http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/abs-20-104>

Reviewer A

The authors described a case of primary breast osteosarcoma. They addressed epidemiological, clinical, imaging and histopathological aspects and the different therapeutic modalities. The absence of protocols for the treatment of primary breast osteosarcoma was clear.

The manuscript is well written.

I have few comments:

- The manuscript pages have not been numbered, which makes it difficult to revise.

Reply: Pages have been numbered as in the CARE reporting checklist

Changes in text: Page numeration

- The immuno histochemical study was conducted? If so, the authors need to describe the findings.

Reply: All immune histochemical findings described

Changes in the text: histochemical findings described lines 78-83

- Authors should cite Figures in the body of the text. They only cited Figure 1. Please review.

Reply: All figures now cited in the text

Changes in the text: "Final pathology was reported as high-grade osteoblastic osteosarcoma (Fig. 3,4,5),"

- Page "5", line 88: The term "hypoechoic" is used for an ultrasound finding. However, in the sentence, the authors describe a mammographic finding. It is necessary to use the appropriate terms for the imaging method. Please review.

Reply: Term changed to radiolucent as appropriate term to use in mammographic studies

Changes in text: hypoechoic changed for radiolucent in page 5 line 91

- Page "5", line 94: Clarify the meaning of "OR".

Reply: OR means Operating room

Changes in text: OR changed to fully written Operating room in page 5 line 97

- I didn't see a reference to the Declaration of Helsinki (see the journal rules).

Reply: Declaration of Helsinki reference added to the ethical statement

Changes in text: Declaration of Helsinki reference added, page 7 lines 146 to 148

Reviewer B

Comments to the Author

This is a nicely written case report.

Only minor clarifications suggested as follows:

1. Osteosarcoma of the breast should be differentiated from other two similar entities, phyllodes tumor and metaplastic carcinoma. It is possible to recognize the former by specific morphological features and the latter by the presence of carcinomatous component and/or immunohistochemical tests for epithelial markers (cytokeratins).

Reply: All immune histochemical findings described, negative for cytokeratins and p63, histological features were typical for what one would find in a tumor showing osteogenic sarcoma differentiation compared to phyllodes tumor

Changes in the text: histochemical findings described lines 78-83

2. Pathological figures are unfavorable. They are low-contrast and out of focus. The authors should show figures, (1) gross appearance of the tumor, (2) microscopic figure of low-power, (3) microscopic figure of high-power, respectively.

Reply: No gross appearance of tumor image exists, only images as shown

Changes in text: none

3. I'm worried that the description of figure magnification statement is correct. (I guess figure 4 is of magnification x400.)

Reply: Image magnification corrected to x400

Changes in text: H and E, high power magnification x 400).