

**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:	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
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.journalajrru.com/index.php/AJRRU/editorial-policy>)

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	I commend the authors for such article. The authors should provide separate tables for demographics and all tumor characteristics. Moreover, the article lack the survival parameters as well as the follow up protocol and data for such studied population.	We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The demographics and tumor characteristics are presented in a paragraph form because the data was not elaborate enough to be presented in a table form. However, we have added a few tumor characteristics that were overseen earlier, such as tumor size and number of tumors and patient characteristics such as serum creatinine. In the case of multiple tumors, the tumor with the maximum VI-RADS score was considered. We have also shared our master chart for the scrutiny of the esteemed reviewers. The purpose of this article was only correlation of the VI-RADS score with muscle-invasiveness and tumor grade. After TURBT, the patients were managed as per the HPE report and the ECOG status of the patient. However, inclusion of survival parameters of all patients and follow-up protocol was beyond the scope of the present article.
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	Some linguistic correction is needed.	This has been done.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.