**Resposta aos Revisores**

We thank the reviewers for all suggestions and corrections. A point-by-point reply ensues and all modifications are included in the revised manuscript, accordingly.

**Revisor 1 Comentário 1**

1. “In the Portuguese abstract it is missing information that is in the
English version.” -> I believe that there is still some information in the
English abstract version that is missing from the Portuguese one as, for
example, in the METHODS, “all patients ever treated in our unit” or in
the RESULTS, “median disease duration was 12 years”.

**Resposta Revisor 1 Comentário 1**

The missing information was added to the Portuguese abstract.

**Revisor G comentário 2**

2. “Revisor G Comentário 8 - For the statistical analysis in METHODS the
text now reads: (…) The T test was used for comparison between normally
distributed variables (…) Overall, only nominal two sided p values
of“The T test was used for comparison between the means of normally
distributed variables (…) Overall, only nominal two sided p values of

**Resposta Revisor G comentário 2**

The text now reads: A p value < than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

**Revisor G comentário 3**

3. “Answer to Revisor G Comentário 9: The median age of the patients is
shown in supplementary table I. Females are younger than males. According to
the statistical test, this is a statistically significant difference.”
:The test that is depicted in Supplementary table I is a Mann-Whitney-U-2
tailed, meaning that you are testing the equality of populations against the
hypothesis that they are different, not that the females’ median is
smaller than the male’s median (even if the estimates point at that
direction). So, the conclusion that you may take from the test is that the
populations are different, it you like, significantly different. If you want
to maintain your conclusion, you have to run a one sided Mann-Whitney test
to confirm whether female age population is smaller than male’s.

**Resposta Revisor G comentário 3**

We are sorry for this and thankful for your help. This was a mistake and has now been corrected in the text and Supplementary Table I. The Mann-Whitney shows no statistically significant difference in age between males and females (exact p test). The statistical test used has also been corrected in the Supplementary table and values corrected in the Supplementary table I, to reflect the exact p values.

**Revisor G comentário 4**

4. “Answer to Revisor G Comentário 11: It has now been added in Material
and Methods and removed from this section.”: Can’t find where has it
been moved.

**Resposta Revisor G comentário 4**

This can be found in the text under : **1. STUDY DESIGN AND POPULATION**

*This is a cross-sectional study that took place in an outpatient care setting between December 2017 and May 2018. We only included patients that were on biological therapy for at least three months. All fulfilled the American College of Rheumatology 1987****9*** *and 2010****10*** *revised criteria for the classification of Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) and were aged ≥18 years. Our Unit´s database allowed us to identify 94 patients with RA that started biological therapy (bDMARD) from 01/2002 (date of first bDMARD treatment in the Unit) to 12/2017.*

**Revisor G comentário 5**

5. “Answer to Revisor G Comentário 16: this observation has now been
added to table II and it states in the text “the latter almost three times
more frequent in men”.  Yes it has; but isn’t it strange to only depict
these values separated by sex and not any of the others?

**Resposta Revisor G comentário 5**

We agree it looks strange and have withdrawn the statement about university education and the corresponding variables from the table.

**Revisor G comentário 6a**

6. “Answer to Revisor G Comentário 29”:- In Supplementary Table IV, under “EQ\_5D Pt tariff” one can read “(D1model)”, that should be removed, right?

**Resposta Revisor G comentário 6a**

Right. It has been removed

**Revisor G comentário 6b**

- “Full data as regards professional status are shown in Supplementary
Table IV. Unemployed patients (n=8) had a significantly lower EQ-5D
Portuguese tariff when compared to employed patients (n=21) (p=0.012,
T-test), with a similar median age; even though not significantly,
unemployed patients had higher DA28, HAQ and number of deformities in
comparison to the latter.” -> According to Supplementary Table IV, I
believe that you only have information on n=7 unemployed patients and n=19
employed patients to compare; Then you compare ages through medians,
although table depicts means, that might be confusing. Finally, when you say
in this sentence that “even though not significant” are you talking
about age or about DA28, HAQ and number of deformities?

 **Resposta Revisor G comentário 6b**

We have corrected the mistakes about the numbers of patients in the text. This analysis was performed by Prof. Céu Mateus (health economist) and the ages of the patients were analysed as means (the word median has been removed from the text). None of the variables were significantly different between employed and unemployed patients. There was no difference in age as mentioned in the text. We hope to have clarified your question. The text reads “; even though not significantly, unemployed patients had higher DA28, HAQ and number of deformities in comparison to the latter. “

**Revisor G comentário 7**

7. “Answer to Revisor G Comentário 30: As far as the 10-year survival, we
are comparing a mean recall 80 with mean dead patients of 54.3±25. Given a
z value of 2.62 and a critical value of 0.4953, the p value was
1-0.9953=0.0047, allowing for a rejection of the alternative hypothesis. For
the frequency of bDMARD discontinuation, the X2 was 17.8, > than 3.84, which
is the critical value for 2 degrees of freedom. I confirm to have rejected
the alternative hypothesis.” ->

**You have missed the point.** The question was: You conclude in the text that, for example, “The deceased patientshad a statistically significant lower estimated 10-year survival rate at thetime of first biologic therapy (p=0.006)”. **For this you should have tested and rejected that H0: mean\_group\_diseased >= mean\_other\_group versus H1: mean\_group\_diseased < mean\_other\_group,** but I’m guessing that what you
have tested and rejected was H0: mean\_group\_diseased = mean\_other\_group
versus H1: mean\_group\_diseased <> mean\_other\_group.

**Resposta Revisor G comentário 7**

The test confirms that at inception the estimated survival is statistically different between both groups but not that it was significantly higher in the group that did not die (p=0.813). The text now reads: “The estimated 10-year survival rate at the time of first biologic therapy was significantly different between the deceased patients and the recall group (p=0,006) with median values of 65 (29 – 77) and 90 (77 - 90), respectively.” (Supplementary Table V).”



(var1 = deceased (2) or alive (1); var2 = survival)