

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_89798
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Correlation of Multiparametric MRI-estimated Vesical Imaging Reporting and Data System (VI-RADS) score with Muscle Invasion and Tumor Grade on TURBT in Patients with Urothelial Bladder Cancer: A Prospective Cross-sectional Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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:

<https://www.journalajrru.com/index.php/AJRRU/editorial-policy>

**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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>What was the size of the tumour ?? Were they all more than 3 cm??why do we need to do CT or MRI before TURBT if tumour was less than 3cm ? What about multiple tumours ??</p> <p>In the method section second last line positive predictive value and negative predictive values of VI-RADS have been mentioned for statistical analysis besides specificity and sensitivity however they have been omitted in the result section. If PV and PPV were not assessed, remove these two terms from method section or else provide data in the result section for the same</p> <p><b>Detailed comments have been provided in the manuscript reviewer MS word sheet as attached</b></p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We apologize that we failed to mention the tumor characteristics such as tumor size and number of tumors in the original manuscript. Necessary corrections have been made in the resubmitted manuscript. Not all tumors were more than 3 cm. While cross-sectional imaging is not generally performed for tumors less than 3 cm, mpMRI was performed in all patients for the purpose of the study. Due consent was taken from all patients before enrolling them in the study. In the case of multiple tumors, the tumor with the highest VI-RADS score was considered (This was mentioned in the original manuscript).</p> <p>We have calculated PPV and NPV for VI-RADS cut-offs of <math>\geq 2</math> and <math>\geq 3</math>, however, we failed to include that data in the original manuscript. It was an oversight. However, we have included this information in the resubmitted manuscript.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Correction of grammatical mistakes as indicated	This has been done.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The study has been well planned, designed and the article well written and can be accepted for publication after revision.	

**PART 2:**

	<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.