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The authors should address the following issues:

1. Indicate why TUR bladder tumor was not feasible. What caused the aEoepoor visibilityaE? Could a biopsy not have been taken to make the cancer diagnosis?
2. Give a clear rationale why the bladder was opened if it was believed it contained a tumor. Were any other biopsy approaches considered if TUR was not possible?
3. Give a rationale for why the patient did not go on to have a radical cystectomy after it was found that the bladder was full of tumor.
4. Delineate the clinical course and any other treatments the patient received after the diagnosis was made.
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