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**Reviewer’s report:**

**General**

This paper represents a well-written case report of a carcinoid tumor of the urinary bladder. Only six such tumors have been previously reported, and the authors correctly conclude that this rare tumor has to be considered in the differential diagnosis of primary bladder tumors.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)**

none

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)**

1. In the part Case presentation, the authors should include manufacturers and dilutions of the antibodies applied in their immunohistochemical analyses.

2. The authors write: To the best of our knowledge, this is the first case of a well-differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma of the urinary bladder reported positive with this neuropeptide (calcitonin). They should add their opinion whether calcitonin immunoreactivity may represent only an incidental finding or whether it may possibly bear a biological or clinical consequence (for example, clinical symptoms). In this context, the authors should give a note whether preoperative serum calcium level had been determined (and, if so, they should include the level in their manuscript).

3. Phrasing of some sentences is equivocal or not straightforward. Examples:

   # Instead of this tumor shows an appropriate clinical setting (Abstract, line 11, and Conclusion, second last line), this reviewer regards the following phrasing more straightforward: This tumor shows specific clinical, macroscopic and histological features.

   # The authors phrase In conclusion, our findings confirmed that carcinoid tumor of the urinary bladder does exist is somewhat unlucky, because nobody ever had any doubt about the fact that carcinoid tumor of the urinary bladder does exist. A more appropriate phrase would be: In conclusion, we here add another case of carcinoid tumor of the urinary bladder to the existing literature.

   # The phrase Two cases of these neoplasms have been reported recently (1); the authors carried our a critical review of the literature, revealing only 4 previously reported pure carcinoid tumors of
the urinary bladder in which there was convincing evidence of neuroendocrine differentiation (2-5) (Background, lines 2-5) implies to the reader that the critical review of the literature had been performed by the authors of this manuscript (Mascolo et al.), which is not correct. Rather, the critical review of the literature had been performed by the authors of reference #1, Martignoni and Eble, and this should be stated more clearly. Here is a proposal of improvement: Two cases of these neoplasms have been reported recently by Martignoni and Eble (1). According to a critical review of the literature performed by Martignoni and Eble, only four (2-5) of twelve previously reported cases showed convincing evidence of neuroendocrine differentiation and might therefore be regarded as pure carcinoid tumors of the urinary bladder.

4. There are some typographical errors. Examples:

# Genuary 2004 (page 4, line 1) has to be changed into January 2004
# carried-out (page 4, line 5) should be written without a hyphen
# p-53 (page 4, line 16) should be written without a hyphen, as the authors did correctly in line 20
# The subject of the sentence The better differentiated members of this group, carcinoid tumor (page 5, line 5-6) is written in plural, so the authors should add an s to carcinoid tumor
# In the phase Like to the classical carcinoid tumors (page 6, line 8), the word to should be omitted.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors state that At last follow-up the cystoscopic examination was completely negative. It would be interesting to know how many months after primary diagnosis the last follow-up was performed.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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