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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

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 report on a case of primary adenocarcinoma of a defunctionalized urinary bladder. The following points are to be addressed:

1. Title: The authors report on a case of locally advanced and metastatic primary adenocarcinoma of the defunctionalized urinary bladder that was treated by multimodalities. I suggest modification of the title to be more descriptive and specific (for example: Locally advanced and metastatic primary mucinous adenocarcinoma in a defunctionalized urinary bladder).

2. Abstract, introduction and Discussion: In these sections the authors stated 3 different figures for previous reports on primary adenocarcinoma of the defunctionalized urinary bladder, that is to say 3 in the abstract, 4 in the introduction (...We describe the fifth case of ....) and 6 in the discussion. These
conflicting figures need to be revised according to a meticulous review of the literature.

3. Conclusion: The first 3 phrases of this section are better to be transferred to the discussion section, because they are not based on the results of this study. The 4th phrase is OK (the development of mucoid urethral discharge.....). The last phrase is too solid and can not be made based on a report of even 6 cases.

4. References: It would have been better to refer to 2 important references on the topic in the introduction and discussion (El-Mekresh et al, Brit J Urol, 1998 ; Ali-El-Dein et al, J Urol, 2002).
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