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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
Thank you for asking me to review this qualitative research study on patients’ experiences and attitudes towards receiving information about anti-TNF therapy. This was an enjoyable paper, which covers an important gap in the literature.

Major compulsory revisions:
1) Abstract: The final line of the results section does not present the results on the experience of anti-TNF. Please could this be expanded.
2) Methods: The authors state that they use Colaizzi’s procedural steps for content analysis. The term content analysis is often used more to describe a quantitative approach (e.g. X number of patients thought...). How does Colaizzi’s steps differ from traditional content analysis to produce thematic results? It would help to have more clarity in this section.
3) My understanding of this is that it uses a Phenomenological approach.
4) Results: Theme 1 – final sentence. Please add a quote to evidence the statement that participants expressed their trust in the rheumatology team, as the finding that participants will deliberately hide symptoms of infection indicates they do not trust their medical team enough to be fully open with them.
5) Discussion: Could the authors comment on the small number of participants in the limitations of this study and the fact that all participants had received their information from one centre.

Minor essential revisions:
1) Throughout: The word data is plural, i.e. data are not data is
2) Throughout: The repeated use of the word compliance implies that patients are passive in their care, adherence is a more usual word
3) Introduction: Para 1 – could the authors provide a reference for the European Medicines Agency 1999
4) Methods: Para 3 – 1st line – could the authors state one male and one female focus group - I appreciate that it is later stated that 2 groups were used (and this is indicated by the 2 different durations) but it would be useful to have this information explicitly at this point.
5) Methods: Final para – the practice of asking participants to validate the
analysis is more recently thought to be unnecessary in qualitative research. However, I appreciate that this is one of Colaizzi’s procedural steps. Please add the Colaizzi reference again here (perhaps after ‘To validate the analysis’) to clarify that this is why this was done for a reader who is not familiar with these steps.

6) Results: Para 1 – Could the authors rephrase the first line in order to clarify the numbers. At the moment this sentence reads as though there were 10 participants in each focus group, but my understanding from the rest of the manuscript is that 10 participants took part in total (5 in each group).

Discretionary revisions:

1) Title: The quote from Helen in Theme 1: “It could give me two heads and I’d still try it” would make a nice addition to the beginning of the title – describing the findings and may capture the attention of a potential reader.

2) Abstract: In the results section, last sentence of 1st para, the authors may consider altering the word ‘admitted’ to ‘reported’. The word ‘admitted’ feels judgemental.

3) Abstract: In the conclusion, the authors may consider mentioning the issue of concealing illness as this is an important finding

4) Results: Theme 1: Line 10 – as in point 1, the word ‘admitted’ feels judgemental, would the authors consider changing this.

5) Discussion: 3rd Para discusses active and passive decision making. Would the authors consider commenting on whether this might relate to Leventhal’s active and passive coping strategies and whether this might point to a future area of research?

Final comments: If the above amendments are made, I would have no reservations in recommending this paper for publication. The literature has been thoroughly reviewed and the aims are clearly stated. This seems to be a robust qualitative study of an important area of research.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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