Dear Dr. Abt:

Manuscript ID BMJ.2018.043555.R1 entitled “Prostatic artery embolization versus transurethral resection of the prostate for benign prostatic hyperplasia: a randomized, open-label, non-inferiority trial” which you submitted to BMJ,

Thank you for sending us your revised paper, and for your attention to the many reviewer and editor comments. There are just a few remaining points to address, and once that is done, provided we are happy with the results, we would like to publish it in The BMJ.

We are provisionally offering acceptance but will make the final decision when we see the revised version. The report from the manuscript meeting, the comments from the reviewers and general requirements for submission are available at the end of this letter.

We are looking forward to reading the revised manuscript and, we hope, making a final acceptance decision.

Please note that the BMJ might choose to shorten content or replace or re-size images for the print issue.

Please remember that the author list and order were finalised upon initial submission, and reviewers and editors judged the paper in light of this information, particularly regarding any competing interests. If authors are later added to a paper this process is subverted. In that case, we reserve the right to rescind any previous decision or return the paper to the review process. Please also remember that we reserve the right to require formation of an authorship group when there are a large number of authors.

*** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj?URL_MASK=57b7e0841c41403db0c8150eb9fb8d50

Very truly yours,

Elizabeth Loder, MD, MPH
eloder@bmj.com,

In your response to the remaining statistical comments, please provide, point by point, your replies to the comments made by the reviewers and the editors, explaining how you have dealt with them in the paper.

** Comments from the consultant statistician**

REFEREE COMMENTS

Reviewer: 1
Comments:
The authors have provided clear responses to the copious comments from 8 reviewers, including me. I find the revisions highly successful and have only minimal comments on the updated manuscript.

The study by Russo et al was not a case-control study. It was a retrospective analysis of a clinical database, using propensity score matching. I’d describe it as a matched-pair non-randomised study.

The exclusion of a few patients who didn’t receive the allocated intervention is possibly contentious, moving from intention to treat (not claimed) to per protocol. However, as there were so few such patients (4) the impact on the overall findings would be minimal. The inclusion of an analysis adjusting for baseline data suggests that other factors were a more important source of differences between the 2 arms.

I would indeed prefer that the P values for baseline comparisons are deleted as they don’t directly address clinical comparability. CONSORT recommends not to present these values. I’d thus prefer to drop the footnote in Table 1 “All differences in characteristics between groups were nonsignificant.”.
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Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: No

A fee for speaking?: No

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: No
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Have you in the past five years been employed by an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

If you have any competing interests <A HREF='http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/declaration-competing-interests'target='_new'>please see BMJ policy</A> please declare them here:
"Please remember that the author list and order was finalised upon initial submission. The BMJ has an open peer review process. Reviewers and editors know the names of a paper’s authors and are able to judge the work in light of the authors’ conflicts of interest. If authors are added or removed after the evaluation is done, that process is subverted. We reserve the right to require the formation of an authorship group when there are a large number of authors”

**Information for submitting a revision**

Deadline: Your revised manuscript should be returned within one month.