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Dear Editor of the BMC Urology journal,

I would like to thank Rodney Breau and Girish Kulkarni for their comments on the manuscript.

I have modified the manuscript according to the reviewers’ suggestions.

I have addressed Rodney Breau’s comments in the following way:

1. Major revision 1: In the methods section I have included in highlighted text information on when the survey was done, the demographic information of the East of England cancer network and the number of urologists employed in the network. I also include information on how participants to the survey were recruited.
2. Major revision 2: On line 35 I address what is a clinical oncologist.
3. Major revision 3: On lines 49-53 I explain why a further two geographically distinct cancer networks were included.
4. Major revision 4: In the discussion section on lines 157-163 I clarify the statement raised by the reviewer.
5. Minor revision 1: I have modified the statement in the abstract section that active surveillance is a management strategy rather than a therapeutic strategy.
6. I have included the peer reviewed guideline from Ontaria Canada on active surveillance. I have referenced this on lines 170 and 209.

I have addressed Girish Kulkarni’s comments in the following way:

1. Major revision 1 and 2: I have included a paragraph (lines 229-237) on the limitations of the study.
2. Major revision 3: I have as suggested reduced the emphasis on the resource implications an Active Surveillance program would have on health care systems. I have limited the discussion of this (219-228) on the importance of robust cost-effectiveness studies to evaluate the costs and/or savings the implementation of an active surveillance program would incur.
3. I have stated on lines 205-209 that although the NICE has recommended multiparametric MRI for AS patients at the time of enrolment, other guidelines are not prescriptive as to its use at the time of enrolment.
4. Major revision 5: I have amended the beginning of the discussion to address this comment.
5. Major revision 6: I have removed my the statement of the importance of specialised active surveillance clinics in following up patients on active surveillance.

Yours Sincerely,

Yiannis Philippou