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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?  yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes

Langham: Large-scale, prospective …

Reviewers comments 21-05-10

Why limit to at least 100 patients: please add motivation (Unfortunately, data of De Groot M, Appelman M, Spuls Phl, De Rie MA, Bos JD. Initial experience with routine administration of etanercept in psoriasis. Br J Dermatol 2006, 155:808-14, will be missed)

Page 6 1st alinea, what is resource use??

Excluded all studies with ““an experimental element to them: please formulate different

Page 7
TRIP does not include ongoing/planned studies

Add motivation why limit to English language. Add later as a limitation and describe the effect.

Page 11: sentence: Also, in some countries …: what do the authors mean? The discussion should be shortened. Too long

Figure 1: Eligible studies 35 # eligible studies 16?????

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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