

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 81808

Title: Metachronous urothelial carcinoma in the renal pelvis, bladder, and urethra:

A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05654229 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Physician, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 11:45

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-06 03:32

Review time: 4 Days and 15 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish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) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No



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

https://www.wjgnet.com

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors reported a rare case of urothelial carcinomas, which was found at three different sites. This case report may strengthen the cognition of managing this disease.



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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 81808

Title: Metachronous urothelial carcinoma in the renal pelvis, bladder, and urethra:

A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04025443 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Senior Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Russia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-11-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-07 06:56

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-07 13:48

Review time: 6 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



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors! I read with interest your manuscript "Successive urothelial carcinomas in the renal pelvis, bladder, and urethra: a case report and literature review". This case report is generally well-written. However, it requires deep language and style polishing. Is it really a case of "successive carcinomas" or a case of metachronous cancer? Please, consider to change the title, if applicable. I would recommend to add more details on the specificity/originality of the described case (what a reader can learn from the described case? what conclusion(s) can be made based on the described? and whether some change in the standard clinical practice should be made or at least discussed), instead of repeating the data of the case once again. In this part, please, add the details of the possible reasons of such an unusual localization and re-appearance (genetic? viral? etc) if possible. Please, consider to change the Conclusion, as the current one is self-evident and does not require the publication of a case-report. Ethical statement: according to the described, it was not a study, and the subject was treated according to standards of care with the real life influence. The data were collected retrospectively. The subject could provide an informed consent to use the data in the scientific purposes and publication of the data of his examination or even no specific consent. Please, check the Ethics statement section.