**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Quality of survival among symptomatic compared to PSA-detected prostate cancer survivors - Results from a UK wide patient-reported outcomes study

**Version:** 0  **Date:** 25 Feb 2019

**Reviewer:** Asmaa Abdelhamid

**Reviewer's report:**

The authors are to be commended for completing this huge population-based study. The paper is generally well written and addresses an important subject.

I have one main concern and few minor points (all listed below)

My main concern is the study's conclusion which does not seem to be supported by the study findings and its limitations (many of them, but not all, are acknowledged by the authors in their discussion). The conclusion needs to be amended to reflect the evidence.

Minor points:

* Gleason score needs to be explained/ introduced to justify score categories used and to help readers with no subject-specific expertise.

* Since the study included survivors 18-42 months post-diagnosis and considering that functional outcomes could change over-time, was time since diagnosis included as a covariate?

* Introduction page 5 line 1-3 need clarification especially of what "this analysis" refers to.

* In the results section: clarify how the 9% with alternative or unknown presentation were treated in the analysis. It seems that they were excluded, however, this needs to be clarified.

* Based on the above point, you want to amend the final number reported in the first paragraph of the discussion to reflect number of patients used in the analysis.

* A reference to the original aims of the study and its main findings published very recently would help put the present article and its results in context.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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Quality of written English
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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