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## Issue

The reporting of tables and figures needs to be revised. First off, see the European Urology guidelines for the presentation of statistics <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2018.12.014> with respect to precision (4.1). Also see the European Urology guidelines for reporting figures and tables <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030228382030316X?via%3Dihub>.

In particular, the supplementary tables should be presented in a word or PDF document, properly formatted. Excel should be restricted to provision of raw data.

Also, specific to the guidelines, the authors should not use subfigures just to get around figure counts. Subfigures should show the same sort of graph (e.g. survival curves for recurrence, cancer specific and overall survival) or related graphs showing the same data in different ways (e.g. a calibration plot and a decision curve). As it is, the word count for the legend for figure 1 is greater than the text of the entire paper. I think the authors either need to write up their paper as an original research paper rather than a brief correspondence or move all but one or two of the figures to supplementary.

## Response

We agree with the reviewer. In the revised manuscript, we reduced the content of Figure 1 to six essential panels and moved the remaining information to Supplementary Material. We also shortened the corresponding legends. Concerning the Supplementary Tables, we cut down the information amount, e.g. by restricting to the largest effects, and inserted all of them into Supplementary Material.