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Author’s response to reviews:

Division of General Internal Medicine
420 East 70th St., LH-363
New York, NY 10021

Dear Editor,

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript “Which patient reported outcome domains are important to the rheumatologists while assessing patients with rheumatoid arthritis?” (BRHM-D-
19-00003). We have carefully considered all suggestions and comments by the reviewers and editor and made changes accordingly. We hope that with these modifications, the manuscript will be now suitable for publication in BMC Rheumatology.

Thank you for reconsidering our work.

Sincerely,

Iris Navarro-Millán, MD MSPH
Assistant Professor of Medicine
Division of General Internal Medicine
Weill Cornell Medicine
Division of Rheumatology - Hospital for Special Surgery
525 East 68th Street, F-2019
PO Box#331
New York, NY 10065
Phone: 212-746-3443
E-mail: yin9003@med.cornell.edu

Editor Comments:

#1. Please describe the answer to #3 comment from reviewer #1 as a limitation in the discussion section.

We have added the following text to the limitation section of the manuscript.

“It is possible that the distribution of physicians (and their preferences) could have affected the distribution of the topics. The characteristics of physicians were not identified until they had completed the session. We did not determine if either an academic physician, a private
practitioner, early career, or senior career physician made particular statements. Therefore, we could not ascertain what factors may have influenced the voted topics as it was beyond the scope of nominal group session”

#2. Regarding #5 comment from reviewer #2, I think the reviewer wanted to say “please show the detail of the aggregated data”. The reviewer suggested to show the proportion or number of 1) most important, 2) second most important and 3) third most important votes in each statement. For example, the statement and topic with highest votes were “swollen and tender joints and morning stiffness” and Symptom respectively. The reviewer wanted to know if the most of the participants voted the statement and topic as most important. I agree with the reviewer that these should be described in detail.

Thank you for the comment. Table 1 is indeed the aggregated data. Table 1 lists out the statements that received maximum to minimum votes and is a clear representation of the raw data. Figure 1 of the manuscript has the percentage votes per topic across all groups. We generated the information requested by reviewer #2. It is now added as supplement Table 1 and supplement Figure 1. We favor that these data should be added as a supplement instead of adding it to the main manuscript.