

October 26, 2020

Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to respond to the peer review comments and suggestions. We are submitting for your consideration a revision to our manuscript entitled: **“Greater awareness of biosimilars and shared decision-making among patients attending rheumatology practices in Colorado, USA: real-world data”**. Please find below the original referees' comments and our responses (in Arial). We have addressed all referees' comments as follows.

Reviewer #1

This study enough good for publishing

Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions. We hope that our study will become a model for future similar educational efforts.

Reviewer #2:

It is very good idea to evaluate the patients' awareness of our strategy of treatment follow up may be needed to monitor the changes in awareness after applying your recommendation

Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions. We agree that follow up project would important not only for our patient population.

The following sentence from the “Conclusion” section:

Follow up surveys measuring changes in knowledge and awareness regarding biosimilars and shared-decision making among not only patients, but also entire healthcare teams are recommended.

Was modified as follows:

Follow up surveys measuring changes in knowledge and awareness regarding biosimilars and shared-decision making among patients attending rheumatology practices in Colorado remain highly needed. Future studies should explore knowledge and awareness of biosimilars and shared decision-making among members of rheumatology healthcare teams as well.

Science editor comments and suggestions:

Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s);

Thank you for your comments and suggestions. Please note that we do not intend to publish video or supplementary material. Our survey was provided for reviewers' attention only. As such and based on your manuscript guidelines (please see below), these two documents will not be uploaded. Thank you for your understanding.

"If your manuscript has supportive foundations, the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s) must be provided. Otherwise, we will delete the supportive foundations.

If your manuscript has no "Video" or "Supplementary Material", you don't need to submit those two types of documents."

(2) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

As suggested, we have uploaded the required "57514-Figures.ppt" file.

(3) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout;

As suggested, we have added the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please be advised that DOI may not be available for all articles. Also, as suggested, we have listed all authors of the references.

(4) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Please note that we unable to merge all conflict-of-interests forms into one file. As such, we uploaded them under "supplemental file" and "signed informed consent" for each co-author because your conflict-of-interest upload does not allow more than one uploads. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

As suggested, as have added the "article highlight" section at the end of the main text. Once more, thank you for allowing us the opportunity to respond to the peer review comments and suggestions. We look forward to making a positive contribution to "World Journal of Rheumatology".