

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73519

Title: Case report: management about intravesical histological transformation of prostatic mucinous carcinoma after radical prostatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06183516

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Syria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-11-25 13:37

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-01 17:04

Review time: 6 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you all for these great efforts. Also a special thanks for sharing these experiences in managing such cases. The paper contains valuable information with very beneficial review. Kind regards



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73519

Title: Case report: management about intravesical histological transformation of prostatic mucinous carcinoma after radical prostatectomy

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02907574

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-24

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu (Online Science Editor)

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-16 03:02

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-16 05:46

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	 [] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This paper is well written, but this reviewer wants to know several additional points. 1 After RARP, why the doctors did not select cystoscopy or radiographic evaluation such as CT or MRI because prostatic MC had normal PSA value. 2 Please tell me the details of recurrent BT; tumor size, tumor shape (cauliflower shape is not suitable for scientific paper), all the site in the bladder at each recurrence time, pathological T stage.