

08/5/2018

Response to Editors and Reviewers: - Manuscript ID BMJ.2018.043336 entitled "*Risks of ovarian, breast and corpus uteri cancer in women treated with assisted reproductive technology; 2.2 million person years of observation in Great Britain*"

Dear Dr Weber and colleagues,

Thank you very much for your further consideration of above paper for publication in the BMJ.

In the table below we have attempted to address the remaining queries and suggestion made by Professor Deeks

Once again thank you for your time in considering our submission,

Yours,

Professor Alastair Sutcliffe, Dr Carrie Williams and colleagues

Comment Number	Comment	Response
General Comment	The authors should be congratulated on this excellent manuscript. They have responded well to the points made	Thank you
1	Currently there is no justification in the paper for dropping the first 12-months of events in a sensitivity analysis. Please can the authors ensure that they explain their rationale for doing this.	We have added this thanks (Statistical analysis section, methods)
2	There is no method given in the statistics section for computation of the confidence intervals for the absolute excess risk, please add this. Can these confidence intervals also be added to the values in the abstract.	Both added thanks (Abstract and Statistical analysis section, methods).
3	The primary presentation of results is using 95% confidence intervals in tables 2, 3, 4, 5, S3, S4, S5 and S6, which is in line with BMJ policy. The BMJ requires exact P-values to be presented, which have been reported for the trend tests, but * ** and *** notation have been used for all other values. The authors need to review how they present this information. I would encourage them to consider whether these P-values are required at all.	P-values represented by * ** and *** have been removed as suggested. We agree with the reviewer that these don't add further information to the confidence intervals already presented. Exact P-values for trend test have been retained.
4	Could the authors also consider whether it is possible to include the number of person years in each category in these tables?	We have added person-years of follow-up to the tables. In the 'marked changes' version these additions do not fit well. However in the 'clean' copy these extra columns fit well and give the reader further information. Thank you.