Reviewer’s report

Title: Multiple cutaneous metastasis of synchronous urtothelial Carcinoma of the bladder and the renal pelvis: a case report

Version: 0 Date: 30 Dec 2018

Reviewer: Lovenish Bains

Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: Nil

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Not clearly

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:

   - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
   - Main symptoms of the patient
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history- missing
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings-

Abdominal examination - if any lump or mass was felt.
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

Time gap between transurethral resection of tumor and presentation of hematuria is not clear.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits-

Comments: Last follow up missing.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: Needs to work more on review of literature.

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: Needs to be modified

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: Limited interest as similar cases have been reported.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
English language and grammatical corrections needed.

1. Time gap between transurethral resection of a 3cm papillary bladder tumor and presentation ??
   Timing of events to last presentation is not clear. The case summary can be reshaped. What were the abdominal findings when patient presented last.

2. The whole body CT- is the author referring to PET CT ??

3. Whole body CT was done showing a multiple pulmonary metastases but no local recurrence- is the author again referring to PET CT ?? (Add pictures of the same in the manuscript)

4. Which chemotherapy patient received ?

5. What is the follow up of the patient as of today ?

6. Rather than isolated cutaneous metastasis, this appears a case of whole body metastasis with pulmonary and cutaneous sites.

7. Discussion seems inadequate.
   a. The incidence of urinary malignancies metastasizing to the skin is varying from 0.73% to 3.8.
   Specify which % is for kidney or bladder as kidney is most common for cutaneous malignancy out of all urinary malignancies.
   b. What are various presentations of cutaneous spread of bladder cancer
   c. Out of the mechanisms listed for cutaneous metastasis, authors think which one is more relevant in their case as there is no loco-regional recurrence.
   d. Review of literature can be more.

8. Pictures of CT scan or PET CT scan showing cutaneous involvement and no locoregional involvement will add substance.

9. Histopathological picture showing tumor type in metastatic lesion may also add substance.
10. References need to follow uniform style like Vancouver or APA. They seem out of sync.

11. Since many such cases have been reported, the number of references can go up.
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