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Reviewer's report:

Although the topic of the study is of great importance the study itself has many limitations: it would require a native speaker to fix typos, errors of grammar and style etc.

Intro:
- Would mention studies already assessing risk of atherosclerosis in RA patients.
- What is the novelty of this study beside the fact that it is studied in the DRC?
- p2 second paragraph: "This high frequency of CV morbidity.. " not well formulated. Do you talk about incidence, prevalence or the higher risk?
- P2 second paragraph last sentence '… are also major cardiovascular risk.' ?? factors? Drivers of risk??

Methods:
- I would strongly recommend to change to outline and formatting of this section; the section 'definition of some concepts' is very unusual and does not make much sense to me..
- Alcoholism is not a CV risk factor
- Severity defined by HAQ>0.5 - what is the rationale behind that? Seems like an arbitrary cut-off to me..
- Statistical analyses needs to be better explained
- Sample size too low to perform regression analyses including >8 different covariates. Are covarites included independent - problem of colinearity?!

Results:
- Again, results are not presented very well; re-writing required
- It is no surprise that patients with higher prevalence traditional CV risk factors have higher frequency of subclinical atherosclerosis

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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