

Reviewer 2 comment	Author response
Cluster analysis should be explained in more detail. The authors describe that a “cluster analysis was used to classify patients into homogeneous subgroups according to their preferred IBD items”. However, they fail to detail the metrics of this clustering (i.e. how many patients fell into each cluster; how many patients of each cluster were included for each parameter analysis (Figure2), etc.). - Cluster analysis should be more clear. For example, authors state “Cluster 2 was characterized by more women (146 (62.4%) vs. 42 (40.8%)”, what does 42 (40.8%) refers to: men in cluster 2, or women in cluster 1? And so on for the other parameters analyzed	We further explained and detailed the number of patients in each cluster (Page 9, line 211-217). We further clarified to which cluster the numbers referred (Page 9, line 218, 223, 227).
For the multivariable regression analysis, authors state that “64 patients were not included”. Why?	Thanks for the comment. Patients were not included because of missing data. After reevaluation of the SPSS file, we noticed that actual number of excluded patients was 76, leaving 285 patients in this analysis. This was corrected in (Page 10, line 229-230)
Overall, it is not clear what this study will bring to clinical practice in IBD consultation. How will patients benefit from taking these questionnaires? Should IBD physicians use this when consider treatment options for each patient? Can treatment options be decided taking these questionnaires into consideration? Authors should expand this topic in the Discussion section.	We agree that there is room to elaborate on that. The importance of our findings is explained in detail on the first paragraph of the discussion (Page 11, line 241-250). We added another paragraph elaboration the possible contribution of this study to IBD treatment (Page 13, line 305-308).
Introduction, line 85, “(IBD” should be “(IBD)”	Thank you for noticing. The correction was made
Material and Methods, line 121, “previously-used” should be “previously used”	The correction was made
Material and Methods, Table 2 (Mean priority score given to each IBD Disk item) is presented before Table 1 (Demographic, socioeconomic and disease characteristics of all IBD patients). Authors should rename Table 2 to Table 1, and Table 1 to Table 2	The correction was made
Results, line 185, “including240” should be “including 240”	The correction was made
Results, line 217, 220, 221 “vs.[number]” should be spaced “vs. [number]”	The correction was made

Results, line 230, authors should insert the abbreviation of “odds ratio”	The correction was made
All “p” (of p-values) and “vs” should be in italic	The correction was made

Science editor comment	Author response
The form of the table in the article should adopt the form of three-line table	The correction was made
Please provide documents following the requirements in the journal's Guidelines for manuscript type and related ethics.	The ethic committee approval was already sent as well as STORBE statement according to manuscript type. If any other documents are required, we will be happy to submit them