

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_81525
Title of the Manuscript:	Characteristics of Patients Undergoing Open Radical Cystectomy for Management of Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer in A Tertiary Centre in Egypt
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Aims should not include the number of patients. The same should be included in the results section.</p> <p>Mehtodology – A retrospective analysis of a prospectively maintained data. Such a terminology is not very correct. Its either retrospective or prospective.</p> <p>KEYWORDS Radical cystectomy should be one keyword (Radical and cystectomy should not be separate) Consider replacing bladder with urinary bladder</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>Clarify at the start, whether you are dealing with all bladder cancers or only urothelial cancers. Urothelial and non-urothelial cancers behave quite differently.</p> <p>Therefore we represent the demographic and functional data of 47 patients. Avoid using the number of patients in introduction section.</p> <p>MATERIALS AND METHODS Study population – Should include the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Again the number of patients should be included in the results section.</p> <p>RESULTS Table 3 – Presence of hydronephrosis on imaging. Indicate the imaging modality used (USG / CT / Any other)</p> <p>The paragraph after Table 3. All patients in both groups. Which both groups?</p> <p>Table 4 – Specify why was radical cystectomy done for Ta disease. Nx – means were they operated without pre-operative lymph node staging</p> <p>Table 5 – Correct the numbers for Neoadjuvant therapy. They are totalling 53 !</p> <p>DISCUSSION 2nd paragraph – Both groups? Which both groups.</p> <p>5th paragraph – smoking was more strongly associated with muscle invasive than NMIBC. Is data available regarding how many patients of NMIBC were seen in the same period, and how many of them had smoking history.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>RESULTS Table 1 – IQR. Indicate the full form</p> <p>DISCUSSION 4th paragraph – never smokers. Consider replacing with non smokers.</p> <p>9th paragraph – MR (DW-MRI) can confidently differentiate. Remove the word confidently since the accuracy is not 100%.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<p>Overall a good paper.</p> <p>English language corrections are required at a few places.</p> <p>There is a lot of repetition of data in the paragraphs and the tables which can be minimized. More details can be mentioned wherever there is deviation from standard protocols.</p> <p>Include a paragraph regarding the limitations of the study at the end of discussion section. (like single centre study, small sample size, etc.) A previous study from the same centre (ref no 32) included 229 patients. Since this was a retrospective study, why were all these patients not included in your study?</p> <p>Also mention and specify if the imaging findings were compared with the final histopathology or not.</p> <p>Also include a paragraph at the end stating how the findings of this study will help in the future clinical practice in your area.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chirag Punatar
Department, University & Country	PD Hinduja Hospital And Medical Research Centre, India