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Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

I read the article with great interest. It surveyed the discordance between rheumatologist's judgement and composite measures in assessing remission and identified several factors which caused the discordance. It is very interesting but has several things to be clarified.

1. Many important index were missing, which is the major drawback. Although DAS28-three variables has been validated, it is known that there is some discrepancy between DAS28 (4) and DAS28 (3). The 298 patients who were included in the CDAI analysis had patient VAS so that the authors should be able to calculate DAS28 (4). The supplementary data by DAS28 (4) would corroborate the authors' conclusion.

2. The high proportion of biologic agents use should be discussed. The patients included might not represent overall rheumatoid arthritis population.

3. Table 1 should include DAS28 (3).

4. How were the marginal bone erosion and the synovium inflammation assessed? By ultrasonography?

5. Figure 1A would be better expressed by a pie chart.

6. Figure 2 is a bit confusing. It seems that DAS28 of a part of patients in the concordant - both not remission group is less than 2.6, that of several patients in the concordant - both remission group is more than 2.6, and so on. Should those be not clearly separated?
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