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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting article by Nakano et al entitled, “External validation of risk classification in patients with docetaxel-treated castration-resistant prostate cancer” in which the authors set out to validate the ARC classification system in Japanese men with CRPC who was treated with docetaxel. Though ARC low risk had improved survival compared to ARC poor risk group, ARC was not significant on multivariate analysis. Thus we are unable to fully determine the utility of this classification system in this population. Perhaps if the study were larger this would not be the case. Over all this is a well thought out, well organized manuscript. It may benefit from some grammar and style modification.

Below is a point-by-point critique of the manuscript.

TITLE: No issues

ABSTRACT: In the US there are a few treatment options for CRPC. Have these options come to Japan too? ARC has 3 classes good, intermediate and poor risk. Is this risk of developing complications with DTX? Are responses graded according to RECIST criteria? PSA response was not different between risk groups, correct? However OS was different with poor risk group having the worse OS. On multivariate analysis, ARC was not significant?

INTRODUCTION: No issues

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Define EMB the first time that it is used. So visceral mets only would be 1 on this ARC system? And visceral mets plus anemia would be 2? Why did you not use the pain classification as previously reported with ARC? In assessment paragraph last sentence, remove sentence in place under the stats subheading.

RESULTS: See abstract, Tables and Figures.

DISCUSSION: No issues

REFERENCES: No issues

TABLES:
Table 1 no issue
Table 2 too complicated with lines. Please remove. Please add ARC to analysis.

FIGURES:
Figure 1 no issue
Figure 2 p value is for good vs. intermediate, intermediate vs. poor? Good vs. poor? What?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests.