Answering reviewers

Comments 1：

I could not understand this manuscript on the first time of reviewing because the authors did not address the research question clearly.

Reply：

Dear editor, thank you for your comment!

We have carefully reviewed the manuscript, and made modifications to the content especially in Introduction part based on your comment 2 and polished the language to better describe the research question of this study. The changes could be seen mainly in the Introduction part in the modified manuscript (Page 1-2, Line 1-33). The aim of this study was described in the third paragraph of Introduction (Page 1-2, Line 29-33).

Comment 2:

Patients with clinical suspicion of malignant prostate neoplasm (elevated PSA, suspicious nodule on digital rectal examination) typically undergo systematic transrectal ultrasonography…This paragraph demonstrates the objective of your research. So, the authors need to clarify this reason in introduction section.

Reply:

Dear editor, thank you for your comment!

We have carefully read the content you recommended and revised the Introduction part based on your recommendation. The revised content can be seen in the Introduction part in the modified manuscript (Page 1, Line 4-9; Paragraph 2 and 3 were both rephrased).

Comment 3:

Line 26, PSA level that was elevated but < 20 mg/mL was not correct.

Reply:

Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment!

I believe what you have mentioned is the content in the third paragraph of the Introduction part, specifically "Thus, we reported a feasible approach for COG-TB with our single institutional experience and conducted this retrospective study on a biopsy-naïve cohort with **a PSA level that was elevated but < 20 mg/mL** to evaluate the detection rate for csPCa of COG-TB followed by randomized biopsy (SBx) and to investigate potential influencing factors". We have carefully reviewed the content and found that there was a typing error, to be specific, the "20 mg/mL should be 20 ng/mL". We feel so sorry for the mistake by careless and we have corrected that in the newly manuscript in **Page 2, line 31**, as **a PSA level that was elevated but < 20 ng/mL.**

Comment 4:

The authors' design study as retrospective cohort, but the positive biopsy group has significant higher age (P < .001) than the negative biopsy group which is the real fact; hence any diagnostic methods could demonstrate the difference between both groups. Moreover, the PCa increases with increasing age.

Reply:

Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment!

As you said, patients in positive group had a significantly higher age (p < 0.001) than the other group. As the prevalence of PCa might increases with increasing age, this variable itself could lead to a higher detection rate in the "positive group" due to the possible higher prevalence of PCa. However, as we used the multivariable logistic regression model to adjust for confounders and took "age" as a covariate in the model when analyzing the possible influencing factors for the detection rate, we thought we have taken the above fact into consideration and eliminated the impacts. Thus, we considered the differences in age between the two groups have little impact on our results that the PSAD and PI-RADS scores are independent factors and have not made further adjustments to the included patients and the data, for the time being.

Comment 5:

In table 2, the authors did not show the number of each group.

Reply:

Dear editor, thank you for your comment!

We have added the number of csPCa group (n=56) and non-csPCa group (n=71) in the modified **Table 2**, as you recommended.

Comment 6:

Table 3 and table 4 should be combined and simplified only significant finding.

Reply:

Dear editor, thank you for your comment!

We have combined the Table 3 and Table 4. As we considered that demonstrating the

covariates we included in the multivariate logistic regression model would give the readers a better understanding of our study, we did not remove insignificant findings but only preserved the results in multivariate analysis. Results of univariate analysis was not shown any more to simplify the table. The new table in the modified manuscript is shown as **Table 3**.

Comment 7:

The references were not the correct format.

Reply:

Dear reviewer, thank you for your comment!

We have carefully reviewed our manuscript and made sure that the format of the references was in accordance to the Format References guidelines.