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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: 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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The authors describe a case report of a primary mucinous adenocarcinoma in a defunctionalized urinary bladder. They state that this is the fourth such case reported in the literature. The authors should verify this by reviewing the following reference, which they do not include in their manuscript: Yap RL, Weiser A, Ozer O, Pazona J, Schaeffer A. Adenocarcinoma arising from a defunctionalized bladder. J Urol. 2002 Apr;167(4):1782-3.

The authors state that there are no guidelines for bladder screening in patients who appear to be at risk for the development of malignancy in their defunctionalized bladders. It would be helpful to the practicing urologist if the authors suggest a reasonable surveillance program for patients with defunctionalized bladders. One might consider a surveillance strategy such as
that suggested for patients with intestinal segments in the urinary tract who are also at risk for malignancy.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.