

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise this article. We have addressed both the manuscript issues raised by yourself and of the two reviewers. These changes have been highlighted in yellow within the manuscript. I have summarised these changes below:

**Editorial points:**

- A running title has been added.
- The authors' contributions have been added.
- A core tip has been added.
- The referencing style has been altered as requested.
- PMID/DOI numbers have been added to references aside from reference 6 for which I was unable to find a DOI. This reference may be found at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3545622/>

**Responses to reviewer 1 points:**

- *A reference regarding low rates of complete response was supplied by the reviewer and asked to add it to the manuscript.*

The global complete response rate was noted to be as low as 8% in the reference provided by the reviewer. This figure and reference has been included in the manuscript.

- *The limitations of the studies by Habr-Gama have been highlighted by the reviewer.*

Accordingly we have stated these limitations within the manuscript.

- *DRE appears once within the manuscript without definition of its meaning.*

This appears only once and has been changed to digital rectal examination

- *Consensuses was spelt incorrectly*

This has been addressed in the manuscript.

**Responses to reviewer 2 points.**

- *The reviewer felt type of follow up for each of the studies included was not clear.*

This information has been added to the manuscript.

- *The reviewer felt that the quality of the studies was not adequately addressed.*

This has been attempted within the manuscript.

As requested all changes are highlighted in yellow within the manuscript.

Yours sincerely  
DG Couch and DM Hemingway  
Leicester Royal Infirmary