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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: New associations or variations in disease processes

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General
This is an interesting case report that may incerease the clinical suspicion of clinicians upon such cases.

Revisions necessary for publication
In the Discussion section the authors should comment more upon the association of nephrogenic adenoma and adenocarcinoma.
The references need to be updated as the vast majority is from the 80s.
Major revision is needed to improve the text in terms of grammar, writting, ect.
For example, "..perforation was treated by bladder suture..", "...year. 1.5 years...", "...[1]. 90%...", "...[8]. 55%...", "...[13]. One could ask,..."

What next?: Revise and resubmit

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited