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Editor-in-Chief
Professor Guangde Tu

BMC Dermatology
BDER –D-16-00054

Dear Professor Tu,

Thank you very much for providing us the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript titled “Rationale and Design of the Brigham Cohort for Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis Registry (COPPAR)” to BMC Dermatology.
We have carefully considered all comments and made changes accordingly. Below we list all reviewer comment in sequence with specific responses.

The manuscript is not submitted or under review elsewhere. The funding sources and potential conflicts are disclosed at the appropriate places on your webpage and the manuscript.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any questions.

Sincerely,

Maria Schneeweiss

Reviewer #1 (Remarks to the Author):

This is a well written paper addressing the design and initial implementation of the COPPAR registry. I have no comments.

Response: Thank you for your kind words.

Reviewer #2 (Remarks to the Author):

I agree with the authors that developing a longitudinal cohort to study psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis over time is important and will allow the authors to better understand many aspects of these chronic diseases. Overall, the paper was clear and well written;

Response: Thanks.
However I would recommend the following clarifications prior to publication:

- Please clarify if the registry study visits will be completely separate from clinic care or if follow up information will be collected during routine dermatology/rheumatology visits.

  Response: It is a mix. We now expanded this point on page 8 under registry procedures: “Such visits may coincide with dermatology/rheumatology visits or may be scheduled in addition.”

- Do you have a plan for total enrollment past 1000 per group? Have you performed any sample size calculations to determine the appropriate sample size for the outcomes you discussed, specifically in regards to biomarkers?

  Response: The plan is an ongoing open enrollment into COPPAR (see page 12 last sentence). There is no upper limit targeted at this point, but we have a limited budget. As in almost all registries, there is no sample size calculation. We have chosen 1000 based on the statistical power observed with other similar registries that examine similar questions and have adequate sample size.

- Please clarify if you will continue to collect clinical information and/or biomarkers after the initial two years discussed in the manuscript. I think analysis of long term (> 5 years) follow-up is very important/useful, especially given the goals outlined in the introduction.

  Response: This is an important question, which we have clarified in the manuscript on page 12, last sentence: “These patients will be followed long-term and additional patients will join over time”

- Missing reference, page 4, line 56

  Response: We apologize for this omission. Reference 7 is now listed.
- Add a reference to Table 2 within the body of the manuscript

Response: We have now added a reference to Table 2.