



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 95115

Title: Primary large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the bladder: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 06348941

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree:

Professional title:

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Mexico

Author’s Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-04-01 19:38

Reviewer performed review: 2024-04-01 20:29

Review time: 1 Hour

| | |
|--|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript addresses an uncommon topic, Large Cell Neuroendocrine Carcinoma (LCNEC) of the bladder, which represents less than 1% of all bladder tumors. The uniqueness of the reported case, along with an in-depth review of the literature, adds value to the field of urological oncology and reinforces the importance of considering rare diagnoses in atypical cases. It provides significant contributions to the medical area; however, these recommendations could enhance its impact and usefulness for future research and clinical practice: 1. Although the article mentions potential cellular origins of LCNEC, it lacks a deeper discussion on the pathogenic mechanism and associated risk factors. Understanding the molecular and cellular context could be as crucial as the clinical case itself. 2. The manuscript could have benefited from a more extensive comparison with other reported cases, as well as a discussion of how the treatment of this case aligns with or differs from established or emerging protocols for LCNEC. 3. While the treatment decision based on patient conditions and preferences is mentioned, a more profound discussion of the available treatment options and their evidential bases would strengthen the manuscript. 4. The manuscript underscores the relevance of early



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: office@baishideng.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

diagnosis and comprehensive treatment, yet it does not offer clear recommendations or guidelines for physicians who may encounter similar cases. 5. It would be interesting to append a more detailed discussion on the diagnostic challenges and strategies to improve the preoperative diagnostic accuracy of LCNEC.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 95115

Title: Primary large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the bladder: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2024-04-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2024-04-01 17:30

Reviewer performed review: 2024-04-04 17:29

Review time: 2 Days and 23 Hours

| | |
|--|--|
| Scientific quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| Language quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| Re-review | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors, The research is written in a style that is compatible with the journal's criteria for writing this sort of article, which is excellent. However, the paper is not without some minor remarks that need to be fixed, which are: 1. The study's introduction is fairly simple and should be rephrased into three paragraphs that communicate the following in order: - What is the importance of this study? The first paragraph of the study's introduction must provide a response to this question. - The second paragraph should describe the knowledge gap that the present research seeks to address. - The third paragraph should explain the present research challenge and propose a strategy for resolving it within the constraints of the current study's purpose. 2. Some of the references to the present study are outdated and have no value in the context of the current research. I recommend revising the sources to include references from 2024 and five years before that. Good luck,