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Reviewer's report:

The aim of the paper is to describe treatments, adverse effects and mortality at two years after prostate cancer based on French national health insurance database.

This paper is of importance especially in the current context of the question on over diagnosis of prostate cancer regarding its morbidity after treatment.

Overall, the paper is clearly written, the question posed by the authors is well defined, methods are appropriate and analyses are well conducted.

Minor Essential Revisions

General comments

Abstract

Authors should balance their results regarding potential side-effects of prostate cancer treatments with results of complications at second year.

Methods

Definitions and data analysis section (Page 6, lines 15 to 20)

1) Why the frequency of complications has been compared with the control groups only in men aged 50 to 69 years old?

2) Authors should explain why they choose their control groups in EGB sample instead of SNIIRAM?

Results

Survival section (Page 6, lines 23 to 26)

1) Authors should add a sentence regarding the 1179 subjects who are not alive after two years and who are not deceased (43 600 newly managed for prostate cancer in 2009 – 36 734 men still alive after two years follow-up – 5547 deceased patients = 1179 ?).

2) Same comment regarding the 817 subjects after one year follow-up.

3) It may be helpful for the understanding of all results to add a table with a description of the different treatments by age group in the entire population of the 43 600 men newly managed for prostate cancer in 2009.

4) It may be helpful for the interpretation of the results table 3 to distinguish, as made in table 4, complications at first year and complications at second year (at
Discussion

1) Authors should comment on their 43600 newly managed prostate cancer compare to what it is expected in France on incident prostate cancer for one year which is about 60 000 new cases per year. May this difference have influence the results?

2) Authors should balance their results regarding potential side-effects of prostate cancer treatments. Indeed, they comment only on the two years complications results. They also may discuss complications at the second year that are less frequent.

3) Authors should discuss by adding a sentence on the 1179 “missing” subjects.

Specific comments

1) Page 5, lines 5 to 7: The sentence “The SNIIRAM also includes...” may be removed from this paragraph. Indeed, authors describe the two controls group based on the EGB data elsewhere in the manuscript (page 6, lines 18 to 20).

2) Page 7, line 1: The first sentence “Age standardised death rate...(Table 2) should be moved line 5, before “Lowest rates were found...”.

3) Page 7, line 22: A part of the text is missing “For treatment combinations,... only accounted for 7.4% of all ? cases”.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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