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Reviewer's report:

Aprajita Jagpal et al have conducted a research regarding the PRO for evaluation of patients with RA. This study is unique and interesting. The most important point of this study is to identify which factor rheumatologists consider to make a treatment-decision for patients with RA in daily practice. There, however, are several issues which the authors should clarify in this study.

How did the authors nominate physicians who were invited by emails to participate in this research? How many physicians were invited in total?

In 25 rheumatologists who participated in this research, 76% practiced in private practice. The remaining 24% practiced in tertiary referral hospitals, such as university hospital, didn't they?

As shown in Figure 2, the distribution of the voted topics was different in each group. What factor influenced the difference of this distribution? Did a distribution of physicians depend on the distribution of the voted topics?

Minor issues:

In the result section, " adherence" was voted in only 4%" was described. In the Figure 1, "adherence" was 5%. Which was correct?

There were little a bit of difference between Table 1 and Figure 1 in some technical terms, such as physical signs and physical finding, response to treatment and response, and so on. The terminology might want to be consistent in the manuscript.

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

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

Unable to assess

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

Yes

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:
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