



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JCTI_29876</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Small cell carcinoma of the bladder: review of the literature and case report.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review paper</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1. There are a lot of English Grammar Mistakes so you must improve the English quality.</p> <p>2. There are already a lot of reviews about small cell carcinoma of the bladder: Celik O et al. Diagnosis and treatment in primary bladder small cell carcinoma: Literature review. Arch Ital Urol Androl. 2016 Mar 31;88(1):52-5. Roy C et al. Small cell carcinoma of the urinary bladder: a case report and review of the literature. J Indian Med Assoc. 2014 Jan; 112(1):57-9. Review. Gkirklemis K et al. Small cell carcinoma of the bladder: a search of the current literature. J BUON. 2013 Jan-Mar; 18(1):220-6. Review. Fahed E et al. Small cell bladder cancer: biology and management. Semin Oncol. 2012 Oct; 39(5):615-8. Review.</p> <p>3. On page 4 you say that define histological diagnosis is obtained after electron microscopy studies. This sentence is inexact because the pathology has not always an electron microscope available. Clarify this sentence</p> <p>4. Report more details in the Figure 1 such as scale bar</p> <p>5. There are also writing mistakes that prevent a sliding reading of the manuscript</p>	<p>1. I reviewed the text and tried to improve the quality of the English. I'm surprised since I already published some papers and never got this remark.</p> <p>2. I accept this remark and added the noted publications and others to be more complete</p> <p>3. I changed this item did put electron microscopic examination at the end as additional possibility. accept the remark that this technique is not available in all institutions</p> <p>4. I did skip the figure since it, at the end, does not have an added value to the article.</p> <p>5. I tried to correct this.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		