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Reviewer’s report:

The authors reported clinical utility of a non-invasive urine test, Cxbladder, for risk assessment of patients with no obvious benign cause of hematuria. New test looks quite interesting and clinically meaningful. However, the manuscript should be revised for further improvement.

0. I can't find the name of authority (IRB) who review and approved the study. I can't also find the trial registration number.

1. Study objective is not clear. In abstract/background section they described that "The aim of the present study was to demonstrate the clinical utility of communicating objective information about the likelihood of UC on the diagnostic behavior of physicians towards individual patients with AMH." But, I think real aim was to evaluate clinical usefulness of Cxbladder test. Please, clearly state the aim of the study, and keep focusing it through entire manuscript.

2. What is the major difference from your previous article 'Adv Ther. 2017;3:1087-96'? Primary end-point looks same with same study population.

3. Do you have any data after changing decision and procedures? What is gold standard for cancer diagnosis in the study? Don't you have any possibility of missing bladder cancer?

4. Introduction is too long. Please shorten it to have concise background and objective of the study.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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