

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77392

Title: Intravesical explosion during transurethral resection of bladder tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 00503175

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Croatia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-11

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-16 05:25

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-16 07:52

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Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] 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 article is very interesting and has potential to be published after minor revisions: 1.English language needs polishing. 2.In the text authors used TUR-bT and TUR-BT. In most of the literature TUR-BT is used (my recommendation). 3.In the Discussion section authors stated that intravesical explosion is common in TURP. This is not true statement. According to literature intravesical explosion in TURP is found in up to 0.2% cases. The intravesical explosion is very rare complications in both TURP and TUR-BT. 4.One of the problem of intravesical explosion with intraperitoneal bladder rupture is seeding of the tumor cells. Please, mention this in the text (part Discussion) with some comments and data from the literature.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 77392

Title: Intravesical explosion during transurethral resection of bladder tumor: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06087956

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MS

Professional title: Associate Professor, Chairman, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Afghanistan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-11

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-15 16:21

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-23 18:47

Review time: 8 Days and 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	 [] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] 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

Dear Authors; Thanks for reporting the manuscript entitled (Intravesical explosion during transurethral resection of bladder tumor : a case report and review of the literature)-Manuscript NO: 77819. The case is well reported but needs minor revisions. Important issues that should be addressed are listed below; 1. If the introduction would be expanded by adding more citations it would be better (not obligation). 2. Discussion is well described, but the sentence (some surgeons are used to performing cystostomies before complex transurethral resections. This can certainly increase the risk of bladder tumour dissemination but can avoid the accumulation of gas in the bladder) was not documented by citation, so this fact needs to be cited. 3. The manuscript should be revised according with the Care-checklist criteria. 4. No image regarding the case was depicted. 5. It would be wise If you add the conclusion heading separately.