

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22284

Title: Bladder cancer exosomes: Getting the message across

Reviewer's code: 00505652

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-26 10:17

Date reviewed: 2015-08-28 20:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The paper is very nice and well written. The field of interest is important and useful for WJCU readers. I have only this comment: - please discuss in more details (hypothesis) the role of exosomes in prediction the response to adjuvant therapy for both NMIBC and MIBC.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22284

Title: Bladder cancer exosomes: Getting the message across

Reviewer's code: 00505672

Reviewer's country: Saudi Arabia

Science editor: Jin-Xin Kong

Date sent for review: 2015-08-26 10:17

Date reviewed: 2015-09-05 20:51

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1- Pages of the manuscript should be numbered. 2- "Yang et al. demonstrated that T24 bladder cancer cells". Are they T2 or T4 or T2-4. 3- "Bladder cancer tumors contain high numbers of variable mutations, and tumors of frequently heterogeneous" Tumors of frequently heterogenous should be corrected.