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Author’s response to reviews:

I would like to thank to the reviewers for their precious time and comments. Responses to their comments are below.

Response to reviewer Matteo Vittori, M.D., Ph.D (Reviewer 1):

1. 120 patients are enrolled in this study. Typing error “118” in the abstract, page 3, line 5, and in the Material and Method section, page 5, line 3 are corrected as “120”.

Response to reviewer Daniele Bianchi, MD (Reviewer 2):

1. A short discussion about the reasons of imbalanced clinical features of the patients between the groups and the consequences in the results are discussed in Discussion section, page 12, lines 26-28 and page 13, line 1-5 as “Furthermore, we recognize that our study is also limited by the imbalanced distributions of PSA levels and age, and the differed follow-up period
between the treatment groups which could have impacted our long-term comparisons. Higher pretreatment PSA levels and older age in the definitive ExRT group than the RP group could be explained by the referral of these patients considerably to radiotherapy rather than surgery and shorter follow-up period in the RP group than the definitive ExRT group could be explained by the recently recognition of RP as an optional treatment in the context of multimodal treatment [3,4] in high-risk PCa patients.”

2. Follow-up time is declared in the Material and Methods section (end points), page 6, line 21.

3. Institution name is excluded from the Material and Method section page 5, line 2 and line 4.

4. The sentence starting by a number in the Results section, page 7, line 19 is corrected, and the number “72” is written in letters.