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Reviewer's report:

General
1) This paper is not only for the UK medical staff. The foreign people do not know the different social insurances for the UK patients. Could you explain these differences?

2) With 47% response rate, this paper is representative of the urologist population. More could be better, but the data was interesting. The authors could discuss about this 47% in the discussion and limit the conclusion.

3) In the table 1: are sure for the “% of responders”? 174% seem to be a lot?

4) The authors must present the statistical analysis in “material and method”.

5) In the conclusion, the authors write that differences create “an inequality in the healthcare”. In the results and in the table 1, the authors write that private patients were detected with a lower PSA. What is this difference using the PC PT data? The authors must change the discussion and the conclusion with the result of the active surveillance. Are the authors sure that the difference could change the cancer prognosis for the NHS patients (see the results of the last AUA congress)?

Minor Essential Revisions and Discretionary Revisions

1) In the abstract, you must explain DoH (or DOH the 2 orthographies were used).

2) In the introduction and in the discussion, the authors must write about the Tyrol and Malmoe experiences. Are the authors sure that all the USA had a “national screening program”?

Level of interest: this article must be published with modifications.

Statistical review: Yes.
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