

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 67076

**Title:** Research on the prognosis of different types of microvessels in bladder transitional cell carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 06058667

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-20 23:58

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-21 10:16

**Review time:** 10 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

Thank you for giving opportunity to review this study. In this study, authors quantitatively analyzed two types of MVD in BTCC and compared their relatively different prognostic relationships. Their results showed that the classification of blood vessels in bladder transitional cell carcinoma could act as an important prognostic indicator, and may also be of great significance in the treatment of cancer. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. It's the first report on the correlation between two microvascular types and the prognosis of patients with bladder transitional cell carcinoma, and I think it's well written. However, there are still some points to note: #1. In the abstract, the AIM part contains a lot of background information about the research. I suggest to separate it and add it to the BACKGROUND content. #2. There is no need to describe the details of the method part of the ABSTRACT, but only need to explain what kind of research has been conducted and what indicators have been observed. #3. The introduction of the main text needs to add content in Page 4 Line 10, suggest adding "In this experimental study, we investigated the microvessel density (MVD) in bladder transitional cell carcinoma through tissue microarray and immunohistochemical analyses. By observing the morphological characteristics of blood vessels and the expression of specific markers, we explored the classification of blood vessels in tumors and studied the relationship between MVD and the prognosis of patients." #4. Between the two groups, you can compare the baseline demographic characteristics. #5. All the charts should in the end of the manuscript, please add a scale to the figure. #6. Each figure needs to be marked in the main test, and the figures and tables should be numbered in order.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 67076

**Title:** Research on the prognosis of different types of microvessels in bladder transitional cell carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 06058626

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-15

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-20 23:59

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-21 10:17

**Review time:** 10 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

The manuscript entitled "Research on the prognosis of different types of microvessels in bladder transitional cell carcinoma" was reviewed. The manuscript is well designed and written. This study is an interesting and will affect upcoming research in the same field. The introduction gives a good overview about the topic and the procedures are precisely described. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures and tables are very good, and well discussed. The literature quoted appropriately. I have the following questions and comments: 1- The abstract of the article needs to be more concise, and the methods and Results part are too redundant. 2- Figures are not clear. What is the magnification power used, it should be written next to the figure. The image resolution must be 300dpi and the authors must use the micrometer  $\mu\text{m}$  to avoid the error when publishing the image so that the details are not lost when minimized or enlarged. In addition, Figure 3 is not found, is it lost? 3- I suggest that authors can compare the baseline demographic characteristics of the experimental group and the control group to see if they are statistically significant and comparable.