Dear Editor in Chief

Thank you for your prompt review of our manuscript.

We have modified the article accordingly in line with:

* Formatting of the article including addition of sections and audio core tip
* Formatting of the references section
* **Addition of sub-titles in materials / methods section and results section (further change following Editorial request)**

Thank you for your comments and feedback. We have considered these seriously and modified the manuscript.

1. **Would the outcomes be different in monopolar TURP?**

 Yes possibly – comment added to manuscript to discuss this further

1. **Since the cases were in the learning curve for the trainees, was difficulty of prostate included, such as large middle lobes, larger prostates, patients on long-term catheters etc.?**

Case selection by consultants as to which suitable for trainee or consultant was not undertaken.

Comment added to manuscript to discuss this further

1. **Please clarify definition of mild/moderate/significant improvement after operation?**

Direct enquiry at the 3 month follow up appointment in clinic with the operating consultant was addressed to the (Catheter free) patient as to their satisfaction with symptomatic improvement.

Comment added to manuscript to discuss this further

1. **A practical question is: especially for trainee A who is in his 3rd year of training, is it not a very small number of operations to have performed only 10 TURPs over 1 year?**

Indeed the authors agree this number errs on the low side, however circumstances such as parallel theatres for training, other clinical commitments and personal leave contributed to this number.

Again many thanks for your review and we hope the revised manuscript is suitable.

Dr J Donati-Bourne