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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Anita Williams,

RE: JFAR-D-20-00119 “Development of a national survey on foot involvement among people with psoriatic arthritis in Australia using a best practice approach: A survey development protocol”

We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments and the opportunity to resubmit for publication. We have carefully considered the recommendations, incorporated revisions and have prepared a list of responses below

Reviewer #1:
This piece of work is much-needed and, in my opinion, of a very high quality. There are minor spelling errors to be corrected (convenience not convenient on P5 and contrast not contract on P14) but overall it read very well, was logically structured and addressed the title.
Response: Thank you. We apologise for these errors and have corrected them.

My only recommendation would be to suggest which of the processes was most impactful in achieving the return of data for survey designs with less resource to undertake the full process might use instead.
Response: We thank the reviewer for their comment. We have added commentary related to the most impactful stage to page 16 line 50: “Undertaking several rounds of cognitive interviews among people with PsA in order to revise and refine the survey content and design was considered to be the most impactful of the pre-testing methods in achieving a good response, and other researchers with less time and resources should consider this an essential part of the method in survey development research.”

Reviewer #2:
Many thanks for submitting an interesting and useful methods paper. The quality of the work conducted and the report is very good. I therefore only have minimal comment for author consideration.

Overall: the remit of the report sets out that this is intended to predominantly be a methods reporting paper for the development of survey research. I wonder if it would be of value therefore to further contextualise the anticipated role of the survey(s) produced? e.g. Is the intent for the survey to provide a robust method for future research and data collection or could it be used within a clinical setting? My concern is that with such a well reported method, the survey could be misinterpreted as a robustly created clinical survey for use in practice? It would add value to clarify this point either way.

Abstract: as above, a brief point of clarification about the intended remit of the survey would be of value.

Response: We thank the reviewer for their comment. We have added more detail in order to clarify the remit of the survey on page 2 line 17: “This is a methods paper for the development of survey research.”, and on page 5 line 19: “This is a methods reporting paper that provides a robustly designed method that can be replicated for future survey research. Whilst the current survey was created for research purposes and has not been used in clinical practice, the information it provides could yield important insights for a clinician that may not normally be considered; informing the holistic management of a person with PsA and helping to build a better understanding of the personal impact to better target care.”

Background: no comment - this is well written and provides good rationale and context (outwith previous comments).

Methods: please provide acknowledgement of ethics/governance that was secured to undertake this work.

Response: Thank you for your comment. An ethical approval statement has been provided and referred to in the main text on page 5 line 59 to page 6 lines 1-3. Full details of the ethical approvals are in the ‘Declarations’ section on page 25 lines 14-29.

Results: no comment - these are clearly presented, with appropriate referencing back to previously reported work.

Discussion: The discord noted between patients and clinicians is noteworthy, and it may be of value to further highlight this point - however, this is at the authors discretion.

Conclusion: as per previous comment - please consider adding brief detail concerning the intended remit/future use of the survey.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We have included commentary to clarify the remit and future use of the survey to page 18: “Future work will involve adaption and implementation of the survey in the UK. The findings from the programme of survey research will also be used to inform the development of an evaluative PsA foot-specific patient-reported outcome measure for use in clinical practice and research.”, and to page 18 in the Conclusion section: “Whilst the survey has not been used in a clinical setting with the purpose to better direct assessment and targeted care, future work is planned to determine the feasibility of its use to support assessment in clinical practice.”

Yours sincerely,
Kate Carter
(Corresponding author)
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