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Reviewer's report:

General
Wonderful article addressing the need for better efficacy measures for psoriasis.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Clarify when your endpoint was--I think it was week 12 for all studies mentioned. Consider adding "at week 12" to tables 2 and 3 for clarity. If a patient had an SAE or AE which necessitated discontinuation or a PASI > 8 after endpoint, how did you treat the data?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
Should you include what the DLQI actually is for people who do not do it daily?

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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