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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

Thank you for your large-scale study. It is the observational registry, highlighting PsA patients with older age, PGA, history of infection and DM, and those on anti-TNF were at higher risk of serious infections. And the article provides detailed description of different infections i.e. clostridium, appendicitis, etc.

However, there are several points I would like to clarify with the authors.

(1) Definition of history of infections
It is defined as the infection in the past 3 years with medications prescribed. Do you mean by antibiotics?

(2) As the pneumonia is found to be one of the most common infections in the study, the background history of pulmonary disease is crucial. May I know the definition of pulmonary disease (page 13 & 27)? PsA patients with background of bronchiectasis and tuberculosis who receive Anti-TNF definitely susceptible for chest infection.

(3) It is sensible that PsA patients with DM have more infections (page 11), irrespective of biologic exposure. May I know more about the status of their DM? Are they under any treatment?

(4) Table 1 - in the row of BSA involvement, the SD value is greater than the mean value. The use of median value should be more appropriate.

Thank you for your kind attention.
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