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Reviewer's report:

The authors have assessed cardiovascular risk factors in a group of patients with ankylosing spondylitis eligible for TNF-inhibitor treatment and compared this patient group with the general population. Further, they have evaluated whether patients with increased CV risk received adequate treatment. The manuscript is interesting and well written. The main limitation is that the study group is a selected group of patients with high disease activity and the data is collected from a clinical setting. Please consider the issues described below.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Aim of the study
   a) The first and the second aim of the study is clearly defined and well answered in the manuscript. However, although the third aim of the study at line 117-120 is clearly defined, I am not sure whether this aim is fairly answered in the manuscript due to lack on information regarding the duration of the treatment period and compliance with the prescribed treatment.

2. Methods
   The manuscript is based on data from a clinical setting, and maybe due to this the manuscript lack descriptions of some procedures.
   a) Second paragraph: More details about procedures for blood pressure measurements for the patient group should be added to the manuscript. If this is not available it should be stated that this was done in accordance with general procedures at the hospital.
   b) Fifth paragraph: What was the time period between the first and the second visit for patients that received CV risk management? For example for patients with increased risk, when was it stated that these patients did not meet the treatment goals? And how was the follow up for these patients? And did you register compliance with treatment?

Results
   a) Result section, paragraph two. I think more information about the general population should be added to the manuscript, especially since the references that is cited for this only is available in Dutch (reference 13 and 14). A table describing prevalence of CV-risk factors in the general population compared with the patient group would have been informative in this manuscript. Although figure
2 partly gives this information, I think some information about the exact values in AS patients compared to the general population would have added valuable information to the manuscript (if it is available for the general population).

b) Result section, paragraph 2. Why are BMI and prevalence of overweight not compared to the general population?

Discussion
a) Discussion section, paragraph one. When summarizing the results I think it should be specified that the results are valid for patients with high disease activity.

Discretionary Revisions
1. References
a) Please consider to give more detailed web addresses for reference 13 and 14.
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