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Dear Amanpreet,

On behalf of my co-authors, I thank you for taking the time to provide thorough feedback on our submission. We have revised our manuscript in response to your comments below and are also submitting the updated manuscript for your consideration.
We hope that you will now consider this revised submission as suitable for peer review in BMC Rheumatology.

Thank you again, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,
Alexis Ogdie, MD, MSCE

Comments for the Author

1. Overlap

We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:


This overlap mainly exists in the Methods section. The attached screenshots show where there is substantial overlap with both numbers correlating with the same published work which is mentioned above.

While we understand that this is work that you have previously published, and some of the same ideas are contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work.

Please be informed that we cannot proceed with handling your manuscript before this issue is resolved, and the sections of text in question have been reformulated.

Response: We thank the reviewer for bringing up this point. We have revised the Methods section thoroughly for your review.

2. Consent to Participate

In your “ethical approval and consent to participate” section of your declarations please confirm if an ethics committee approved the procedure for verbal consent, and why they felt the need for written consent was not necessary for this study. Please also detail how you documented the consent.
Response: We have revised the manuscript to clarify that this was a 2-phase study. In Phase 1, qualitative interviews were conducted with clinical experts and patients with PsA via telephone to identify key concepts associated with disease burden and treatment experience; the information obtained were used to develop an online survey fielded to adults with PsA in Phase 2. We obtained verbal consent from interviewees in Phase 1, and electronic consent from survey respondents in Phase 2 as outlined in our IRB protocols which were approved by a central review board, Salus IRB. Both IRB approvals are uploaded as supplementary materials for review.

3. Title Page

Please include the email addresses for all authors on the title page. The corresponding author should still be indicated.

Response: We have revised the title page to provide the information requested.

4. Abstract

Your abstract should include the following headings: Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions, and should be no longer than 350 words. Please also include a keywords section, which should three to ten keywords.

Response: We have revised the abstract accordingly and provided 4 keywords.

5. Authors’ Contributions

Please include the specific contributions of each author. Please represent authors’ names using their full initials, not their full name, in the Authors’ Contributions section. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it clear that the initials refer to separate authors.

Response: We have specified each author’s contribution as requested.

6. Funding

In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: We have described the role of Novartis in the categories listed.