

Reviewer's code: 06058667

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for giving opportunity to review this study. In this study, authors quantitatively analyzed two types of MVD in BTCC and compared their relatively different prognostic relationships. Their results showed that the classification of blood vessels in bladder transitional cell carcinoma could act as an important prognostic indicator, and may also be of great significance in the treatment of cancer. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. It's the first report on the correlation between two microvascular types and the prognosis of patients with bladder transitional cell carcinoma, and I think it's well written. However, there are still some points to note:

#1. In the abstract, the AIM part contains a lot of background information about the research. I suggest to separate it and add it to the BACKGROUND content.

Answer: Thank you. We revised the manuscript accordingly.

#2. There is no need to describe the details of the method part of the ABSTRACT, but only need to explain what kind of research has been conducted and what indicators have been observed.

Answer: Thank you. The methods were shortened.

#3. The introduction of the main text needs to add content in Page 4 Line 10, suggest adding "In this experimental study, we investigated the microvessel density (MVD) in bladder transitional cell carcinoma through tissue microarray and immunohistochemical analyses. By observing the morphological characteristics of blood vessels and the expression of specific markers, we explored the classification of blood vessels in tumors and studied the relationship between MVD and the prognosis of patients."

Answer: Thank you. The introduction was revised accordingly.

#4. Between the two groups, you can compare the baseline demographic characteristics.

Answer: Thank you. Revised.

#5. All the charts should in the end of the manuscript, please add a scale to the figure. #6. Each figure needs to be marked in the main text, and the figures and tables should be numbered in order.

Answer: Thank you. The figures were revised.

Reviewer's code: 06058626

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript entitled "Research on the prognosis of different types of microvessels in bladder transitional cell carcinoma" was reviewed. The manuscript is well designed and written. This study is an interesting and will affect upcoming research in the same field. The introduction gives a good overview about the topic and the procedures are precisely described. The experiment of the study is designed very well, aims are very clear. Methods are reasonable. Data in figures and tables are very good, and well discussed. The literature quoted appropriately. I have the following questions and comments:

1- The abstract of the article needs to be more concise, and the methods and Results part are too redundant.

Answer: Thank you. The abstract was revised.

2- Figures are not clear. What is the magnification power used, it should be written next to the figure. The image resolution must be 300dpi and the authors must use the micrometer μm to avoid the error when publishing the image so that the details are not lost when minimized or enlarged. In addition, Figure 3 is not found, is it lost?

Answer: Thank you. The figures were revised.

3- I suggest that authors can compare the baseline demographic characteristics of the experimental group and the control group to see if they are statistically significant and

comparable.

Answer: Thank you. The manuscript was revised.