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Reviewer's report:

The authors report on a clinician survey regarding active surveillance of prostate cancer. Active surveillance is a timely topic and this study highlights some of the clinical heterogeneity that can be expected when there is low quality evidence to guide patient selection, follow up, and triggers for treatment. I believe this is worthy of publication, but addressing some of the issues below will improve the manuscript and allow the reader to determine if the results are an accurate reflection of clinical practice in the UK.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. There is not enough information about how and when participants were recruited. Was this an email blast? Who received the email and how was the email list obtained? What was the strategy (if any) for maximizing participation (e.g. second wave blast to non-responders)? How many urologists work in the East of England cancer network? What is the population served in the East of England network? All of this information will allow the reader to get a sense of response rate and risk of respondent bias.

2. What is a clinical oncologist? Does this include both radiation oncologists and medical oncologists?

3. Why were 2 other cancer networks included? Was this an initial plan or an afterthought to increase enrollment? As with issue #1, information describing the other cancer networks would be helpful.

4. In the discussion, the authors state that 20% of new prostate cancer diagnoses are low risk prostate cancer. They then suggest this number will increase follow the publication of PIVOT and other trials. I do not follow this logic. Do the authors mean that more will be treated with active surveillance?

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Active surveillance is not a “therapeutic” strategy.

2. There is a peer reviewed guideline for Active Surveillance that should be referenced.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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