

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52285

Date: 16/06/2025

**Title:** "Silicone-Reactional Axillary Lymphadenopathy Resulting from Breast Prosthesis Rupture: A Rare Case Report"

### Recommendation:

- ✓ Accept as it is .....  
 Accept after minor revision.....  
 Accept after major revision .....  
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

Reviewer Name: Dr. S. K. Nath

Date: 17/06/2025

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The paper concludes that silicone lymphadenopathy following breast implant rupture is a rare but important diagnosis that mimics malignant lymphadenopathy. It emphasizes that imaging and histopathology are crucial for accurate diagnosis, and that awareness of this complication helps avoid unnecessary interventions. The case reinforces the need for vigilance in patients with breast implants presenting with lymphadenopathy, especially in the context of implant rupture.

### Reviewer's Comment / Report

#### Strengths:

- Rare Case Documentation:** The paper addresses a very uncommon complication—silicone lymphadenopathy due to implant rupture—adding valuable insight to the medical literature.
- Comprehensive Multi-Modal Imaging:** The report includes detailed descriptions and images from mammography, ultrasound, MRI, and histopathology, providing a thorough diagnostic overview.
- Clear Clinical and Diagnostic Workflow:** The authors present a logical flowchart (Figure 1) and detailed case progression, assisting clinicians in understanding the step-by-step assessment process.
- Histopathological Confirmation:** The case is confirmed via biopsy showing granulomatous lymphadenitis of foreign body type, strengthening the diagnosis.
- Discussion of Pathophysiology:** The paper elaborates on the mechanisms by which silicone particles migrate and induce granulomatous reactions, enriching understanding of the condition.
- Ethical Considerations:** Ethical approval and informed consent processes are explicitly mentioned, ensuring adherence to research standards.

#### Weaknesses:

- Limited Generalizability:** Being a single case report, the findings may not be broadly applicable. It mainly adds knowledge about a rare instance rather than establishing new standards.
- Lack of Long-Term Follow-Up:** The report mentions initial postoperative recovery but lacks information about longer-term outcomes or recurrence.
- Literature Context:** While the paper references prior cases, it could benefit from an extended review of recent advances or larger case series related to silicone lymphadenopathy.
- Absence of Quantitative Data:** The report discusses incidence and prevalence as "unknown" or "rare," but lacks detailed statistical analysis or a literature-based risk assessment.
- Limited Discussion on Differential Diagnosis:** Although malignancy exclusion is emphasized, more detailed differentiation criteria versus other causes of lymphadenopathy (e.g., infection, other granulomatous diseases) could improve comprehensiveness.