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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,

With interest I read your manuscript, which addresses a research question with interest to the clinical practice. The introduction support well the study and is very well written. The methods are concordant with the aims. The results and conclusion are also correct in this respect. I do have, however some questions/comments:

1) Both in the abstract and in the beginning of the methods you refer this was a "Two phase study". The reason for this is completely understandable and correct. My questions are:
   1.1. have you considered to designate this as a "Mixed-methods study"? I would suggest you to read this editorial from Elisabeth Halcomb - Mixed methods research: The issues beyond combining methods - Journal of Advance Nursing. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13877
   1.2. You only report the results of the quantitative study. Have you considered to present, even briefly, the qualitative part? I would be in favor of it, even if mainly in Supplementary material. Are you considering to present those results in another publication?

2. Also in the methods section, in the end of the description of "study variables" you correctly described the stratification of time to diagnosis into 3 categories. In the following section (“Data analysis”) you seems to repeat part of this information: "Data were additionally stratified by time to PsA diagnosis using χ2 tests to analyze differences across the groups". This sentence seems a bit confusing. Maybe instead of “using chi-square” you may say "and chi-square was used to".

3. You report a total of 203 respondents. Which was the response rate?

4. Which was the period of data collection? this is important to put the conclusion in (time) context.

5. In the results section, page 8, last sentence of first paragraph, reporting the comparison of characteristics between time to diagnosis group, I did not make the same interpretation of the Table 1 results. For instance, the % of respondents with high school education was: 4.3% (<6 months), 1.5% (6m to 4y), and 9.1% (≥5y of diagnosis). but you reported that faster times to diagnosis (<6m) appeared to ... have higher education...
6. Regarding Table 1, the "italics" to highlight statistically significant differences is hard to be seen/differentiated.

Globally, the manuscript is very easy to read and interpret. My congratulations.
Wish you all the best in improving this manuscript.
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