

Dear reviewers and editor,

RE: Manuscript NO: 77392 entitled “ **Intravesical explosion during transurethral resection of bladder tumor : a case report and review of the literature**”

Thank you for your kind letter regarding the above-mentioned manuscript. We appreciate the time and efforts of the reviewers and editors, as well as their valuable comments. These concerns are addressed in the revised manuscript. The following is a point-by-point response on how we responded to the reviewers' critiques. All changes made in the revised manuscript are highlighted in yellow for your attention.

Reviewer #1: 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).

Thank you for your valuable comments. The introduction was expanded.

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.

The article was cited.

3. The manuscript should be revised according with the Care-checklist criteria.

We have double checked the criteria.

4. No image regarding the case was depicted.

Thanks for your comments. It will be better with image showing the case, but the picture we got was bloody, which is not suitable for publication. We are really sorry for this.

5. It would be wise If you add the conclusion heading separately.

Thanks for your suggestion. The heading was added.

Reviewer #2: This article is very interesting and has potential to be published after minor revisions: 1.English language needs polishing.

The language was edited by native english speaker.

2.In the text authors used TUR-bT and TUR-BT. In most of the literature TUR-BT is used (my recommendation).

Thanks for your suggestion, we have revised this accordingly.

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.

You are correct. We apologized for this mistake.

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.

Thanks for your valuable comments. We have revised this in the manuscript.

Hope those revisions are satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Zhengsheng Pan, MD