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BMC urology
RE : submission BURO-D-18-00379R1

Dear editorial office,
Our revised manuscript titled, “A retrospective feasibility study of biweekly docetaxel in patients with high-risk metastatic castration-naïve prostate cancer” is enclosed for consideration for publication as an original article in “Journal of cancer”.

Our responses to the reviewers are detailed below.

We appreciate the thoroughness of the reviewers and hope that these changes adequately address their concerns. These changes were indicated with blue in the revised manuscript.

Best Regards,

Editor Comments:

1. Reviewer 2 Final Comment

We would like to draw your attention to this final comment from reviewer 2:

The authors have done an excellent job of responding to the reviewer critiques.

the only thing I would ask them to consider revising is the added text in the discussion beginning line 234 which states:

The major limitations of our retrospective study include small sample size, lack of enforcing rationale and clear explanation of impact of results.

The rationale has now been added in the background section, so the lack of enforcing rationale is no longer true.

perhaps rephrase "clear explanation of impact of results" to say something more concrete like "lack of a control arm to better define differences between biweekly dosing and standard dosing in this population"

Please ensure that this is addressed in the revised version of your manuscript.

►Thank you for your comments. I agree on your opinion.

According to your comments, we modified the paragraphs as follows;

“The major limitations of our retrospective study include small sample size and lack of a control arm to better define differences between biweekly dosing and standard dosing in this population.”
2. Abstract

We note that all or parts of your abstract have been previously published in conference proceedings. Please declare in the Acknowledgements that the abstract was previously presented at a named conference.

► Thank you for your comments. Content has been added to 3. Declarations.

3. Declarations

We note that most of the Declarations are missing. Please note that all manuscripts must contain all the following sections under the heading 'Declarations'. The Declarations should follow the Conclusions section, and be before the References.

► Thank you for your comments. I added a declaration as shown below.

“Abbreviations

ADT: Androgen-deprivation therapy; GNRH: Gonadotropin-releasing hormone; CRPC: Castration-resistant prostate cancer; CNPC: Castration-naïve prostate cancer

Acknowledgements

Abstract of this manuscript is presented in annual meeting of ASCO 2018.

Funding

No funding was obtained for this study.

Availability of data and material

The information supporting the conclusions of this article is included within the article. Further information can be obtained upon request.

Authors' contributions

SHP conceived and designated the study; SEY, SEP, YJK and JJC participated in its design and coordination and helped to draft the manuscript. HGJ, HYC and SJL performed relevant operations and collected patients’ data; MYK and HHS helped acquisition and interpretation of
data; SEP and SHP participated in the statistical analysis; BCJ, SLS, SSJ and HML critically revised the manuscript; All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This research is strictly retrospective and involving the collection of existing data and records. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Samsung Medical Center (Seoul, Korea; IRB_2017–01-005) and written informed consent was provided by all patients prior to starting chemotherapy, according to our institutional standards.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

4. Cite Figure 1 in text

We note that Figure 1 is not cited in the main manuscript text. Please ensure the figure is cited.

►Thank you for your comments. I added the figure 1 to line 181.

“Median PFS was 13.6 months (95% CI: 6.7–20.4). Median OS was not reached, but the OS rate at one year was identified as 75% (figure 1).”

5. Clean copy

At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

►I uploaded the revision to the site.

We appreciate the thoroughness of the reviewers and hope that these changes adequately address their concern. These changes were indicated with red in the revised manuscript.
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