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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Hsu et al. reported an interesting case of concurrent prostate cancer and urothelial cancer, the patient was successfully treated. The study includes required features. Major concern: 1. It was notable that some previous studies have registered for such cases, for example, PMID: 35288430; PMID: 23671490; PMID: 25847902. It was not appropriate for the authors to say: “first known instance” or “first to document the simultaneous presence” in this paper. Also, it would be better to make a case summary and literature review based on previous studies. 2. It seems like the patient received neoadjuvant ADT before the surgery for PC, when did the authors determined to conduct the surgery after such treatment? A treatment fishbone diagram for the case would be appreciated. 3. The patient also received gemcitabine and cisplatin, and immunotherapy with nivolumab, these treatments aimed to treat the UC. What is the evidence for these treatments since the stage of UC was very early in this case? 4. It was not enough for the differential diagnosis by the IHC markers including AMACR, GATA3 in this case, more markers are needed since UC can mimic PC (PMID: 27385897; PMID: 27385897) or invade into the prostate. 5. The potential mechanisms for synchronous PC and UC should be addressed.
in discussion.
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The authors have revised the paper according to the comments; and its quality was improved. I would like to recommend it for publication.