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Reviewer's report:

Review "Patient Perspectives on the Pathway to Psoriatic Arthritis Diagnosis: Results From a Web-Based Survey of Patients in the United States"

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper on the topic of Psoriatic Arthritis diagnosis. The paper is nicely written and covers interesting insights on this topic.

However, I have some minor and major concerns which I would be happy if addressed in the revision of this paper:

Introduction: The introduction is written nicely. I have only one minor comment on it.
1) Minor: Introduction: I would welcome it if, in addition to the estimated prevalence, the total number of people affected were included too.

Methods:
2) Major: Methods: The authors write in the first paragraph: "Phase 1 consisted of targeted literature review and qualitative interviews with clinical experts and adults diagnosed with PsA via telephone to identify key concepts associated with disease burden and treatment experience. The key concepts identified were used to develop an online survey fielded to adults with PsA in Phase 2." I have some comments/questions to according this paragraph:
   - I did not find a description of the literature review?! Can you please provide more information? Keywords, databases, data extracted, ... ? Which data/questionnaires were used to create the questionnaire used in this study? Maybe as an appendix, if you have not enough words to do this in the methods section.
   - Interviews with clinical experts/adults with PsA: Can you please provide more information? I did find the guideline in the appendix (Thank you for that) - but did not find anything about analysis, concepts, ...?!
   - Questionnaire: How was the questionnaire created in the end? How was the questionnaire tested? How did you test the validity and reliability of your questionnaire? Can you also please present the whole questionnaire as a supplemental file?
3) Minor: Methods: Please check the reporting guidelines for conducting and reporting of survey research (such as the "Improving the quality of Web surveys: the Checklist for Reporting Results of Internet E-Surveys (CHERRIES)" or the guideline "Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research") and give all the necessary information. I would also appreciate it if you put the checklist in the appendix to enable the reader to quickly check the quality of your paper.
4) Minor: Methods: You write: "All participants were required to provide verbal and electronic consent and authorization prior to participating." How did you obtain the oral consent of all 203 participants?
5) Minor: Methods: You write: "Continuous variables were presented using means and SDs" - were these data normally distributed? If not please provide median and range too.
6) Minor: Methods: Did you correct for multiple testing? If yes, please describe it (Bonferroni? Bonferroni-Holm?). If not - please give a statement of why you did not. Because you did a lot of testing :)

Results:
7) Minor: Results: Please be more clear and display also values in the text (especially the p-values, because they are also missing in the tables), especially if you talk of " differences".
8) Minor: Results: Please provide p-values in the tables, especially if you did no correction for multiple testing.
9) Minor: Results: You had 203 respondents - what percentage is that to the total number of people affected?

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.

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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