

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 32074

Title: Radical cystectomy and en-bloc resection of enterovesical fistula from bladder cancer

Reviewer's code: 00468558

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-12-28 08:07

Date reviewed: 2016-12-29 22:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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"/> 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 checked="" 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

Authors deal with a very rare case of EVF caused by urothelial malignancy. The case report is well written, clear and concise. The case management is unremarkable. Pelvic exenteration and faecal and urinary diversion was the only reasonable choice. Indeed, I wonder why a colonoscopy was performed. The issue should be discussed.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS manuscript NO: 32074

Title: Radical cystectomy and en-bloc resection of enterovesical fistula from bladder cancer

Reviewer's code: 03618990

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-12-28 08:07

Date reviewed: 2017-01-02 23:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input 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"/> 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 checked="" 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

Please discuss further the diagnostic workup including urologic and gastrointestinal endoscopic approaches.