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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #2

Page 7, line 27: recommend removing "indicating that CT participants were not simply a more prognostically favorable group". The preceding sentence lists factors that do make the CT participants a more prognostically favorable group, so this part of the sentence does not make sense after the new additions to the paragraph.

REPLY: We agree that the sentence, "indicating that CT participants were not simply a more prognostically favorable group", does not correlate with the preceding sentence. According to the reviewer’s suggestion, we have removed this sentence from the manuscript (Discussion section, line 12, page 7). Thank you for this comment.

Again recommend removing the conclusion that CT "participation confers as inherent survival advantage." from page 9 line 3. This conclusion is an overstatement of the association detailed in this paper. The authors demonstrate that CT participation is associated with improved survival
(along with several other factors), not that CT participation inherently causes improved survival. The authors can conclude that CT participation is associated with survival, and that trial participation should be offered to patients.

REPLY: We agree with the reviewer that the conclusion, CT participation inherently causes improved survival, cannot be demonstrated with our data and that it is an overstatement. We agree to state that our findings imply that CT participation is associated with CSS, and that CT participation should be offered to patients with CRPC whenever indicated. This change has been made to both the Abstract and Conclusions sections (Abstract section, lines 8-10, page 2; Conclusions section, lines 29-30, page 8). Thank you indeed for your worthy comment.

Reviewer 4

I think that the revision might be suitable for publication in BMC Cancer.

REPLY: Thank you very much for the thorough review. We had agreed with all specific comments that were raised, and have revised our paper according to the useful suggestions. Owing to your first review, we were able to revise our manuscript for improvement.