

BMJ - Decision on  
Manuscript ID  
BMJ.2018.043336.R  
1

**Body:**

16-Apr-2018

Dear Dr. Williams

Manuscript ID BMJ.2018.043336.R1 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"

Thank you for sending us your paper. We sent it for external peer review and discussed it at our manuscript committee meeting. We recognise its potential importance and relevance to general medical readers, but I am afraid that we have not yet been able to reach a final decision on it because several important aspects of the work still need clarifying.

We hope very much that you will be willing and able to revise your paper as explained below in the report from our statistical advisor, so that we will be in a better position to understand your study and decide whether the BMJ is the right journal for it. We are looking forward to reading the revised version and, we hope, reaching a decision.

Yours sincerely,

dr. Wim Weber  
European editor, The BMJ  
wweber@bmj.com

\*\*\* 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=16529cfe1cc9464892ebe2366c00e5d0](https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj?URL_MASK=16529cfe1cc9464892ebe2366c00e5d0)

First, please revise your paper to respond to all of the comments by the reviewers. Their reports are available at the end of this letter, below.

\*\* Comments from the external peer reviewers\*\*

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation:

Comments:

Statistical Review BMJ.2018.043414.R1 Professor Jon Deeks

The authors should be congratulated on this excellent manuscript. They have responded well to the points made. I have a small number of suggestions to improve presentation.

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.

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.

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. However there are problems in the presentation of P-values in these tables. 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.

4) Could the authors also consider whether it is possible to include the number of person years in each category in these tables?

Additional Questions:

Please enter your name: Jon Deeks

Job Title: Professor of Biostatistics

Institution: University of Birmingham

Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: No

A fee for speaking?: No

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: No

Funds for a member of staff?: No

Fees for consulting?: No

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: