

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54961

Title: Surgical outcomes of bladder augmentation: a comparison of three different augmentation procedures

Reviewer's code: 02855845

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Canada

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-02 11:16

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-02 12:15

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting study of surgical outcomes of bladder augmentation. The manuscript is well written, the results are interesting. I recommend to accept it for publication after a minor editing.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54961

Title: Surgical outcomes of bladder augmentation: a comparison of three different augmentation procedures

Reviewer's code: 01524425

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FRCPC, MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-03-25 12:31

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-13 11:18

Review time: 18 Days and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The primary indications for augmentation cystoplasty are low bladder capacity and poor compliance that are refractory to conservative treatment methods such as anticholinergic medication, botulinum toxin A injection, and clean intermittent catheterization. The principal procedure of auto-augmentation is detrusorectomy, which resects part of the detrusor muscle to create a bladder diverticulum. In seromuscular cystoplasty lined with urothelium, detrusorectomy is performed first, after which the bulging urothelium is covered with a de-epithelialized patch of bowel. During of seromuscular cystoplasty lined with urothelium, the bladder epithelium is covered with the intestinal seromuscular layer, which is the main difference with the procedure of auto-augmentation. This study designed to assess the outcomes of patients undergoing auto-augmentation and seromuscular cystoplasty lined with urothelium , and whether seromuscular cystoplasty lined with urothelium could provide a better urodynamic results than auto-augmentation. The methods are very clearly described, and reasonable. Results are interesting and well discussed. References are updated. Please make a short discussion about the limit of the study. Tables requires editing. Minor language polishing should be corrected.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 54961

Title: Surgical outcomes of bladder augmentation: a comparison of three different augmentation procedures

Reviewer's code: 01563469

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: FEBG, PhD

Professional title: Professor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2020-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-02 11:17

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-13 11:19

Review time: 11 Days

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very interesting study. Only the tables should be edited. I have no specific comments.