Reviewer’s report

Title: Resource utilization and costs associated with the addition of an antimuscarinic in patients treated with an alpha-blocker for the treatment of urinary symptoms linked to benign prostatic hyperplasia

Version: 0 Date: 06 Jun 2017

Reviewer: Anastasios Athanasopoulos

Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper and has some useful information.

Specific comments to authors:

Line 88: It would be useful to be added a reference of a review paper addressing this issue like (The role of antimuscarinics in the management of men with symptoms of overactive bladder associated with concomitant bladder outlet obstruction: an update. Eur Urol. 2011 Jul; 60(1):94-105)………in this patients population (ref).

Line 121: please justify the exclusion criterion c.

Line 123: Please correct urethral structure, to the correct: urethral stricture.

Line 244: What does the statistical difference of the cost means? I think it is without any substantial significance.

Discussion

I suggest that the authors have to address three points

a) A comment about the reason for lower use of concomitant medication would be of interest

b) A comment about the lack of reducing statistically significant the use of pads the combination treatment, would be useful. It is supposed that antimuscarinics are effective in reducing urge urinary incontinence.

c) A comment about the fact that from the initial source cohort of 26690 patients (LUTS who started add-on therapy) only 6523 where categorized with BPH diagnosis would be useful and furthermore on the fact that only a small minority finally where at the group of combination treatment. It is not clear to me.
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