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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The response rate has improved from 19% to 47%. However it is still low thereby introducing the possibility of bias. This needs to be discussed in more detail as it still affects any comparisons e.g. the regional comparisons.

An important point to take into consideration is the fact that the PSA guidelines are intended as referral guidelines for GPs to be used with asymptomatic men. They were not intended for use by urologists and were therefore not sent to urologists (a copy was sent to each GP in the country). The authors need to discuss how urologists are using the guidelines e.g. to guide whether a man should have a biopsy or not. Also it is not necessarily the case that the same PSA level as was used for referral should be used to guide further investigation. A recent publication has looked at GP use of the guidelines:


The reference provided for the guidelines (ref 8) is incorrect. The correct reference is:


This should also be corrected on page 4 - the guidelines are for GPs not 'physicians'.

I can not see why the regional information is anonymised. As such it is not informative.

In the conclusions it states that a significant proportion of urologists appear to be unaware of the guidelines. As the guidelines were not intended for urologists is this surprising?
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