

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Rheumatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12218

Title: HOW TO CHOOSE THE BEST BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS? A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Reviewer code: 00227340

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-29 16:00

Date reviewed: 2014-08-18 21:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Your manuscript is quite good but I'd like to underline some aspects: -English Language being optimized -References are not always in accordance with author's guidelines (please check!) -A large number of limitations as correctly indicated is present (not so high priority for publication) -Quality of first 3 tables should be optimized And finally a fast note: in manuscript I read use of EULAR 2010 guidelines, is it wrong or right?

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Rheumatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12218

Title: HOW TO CHOOSE THE BEST BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS? A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Reviewer code: 00505759

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-29 16:00

Date reviewed: 2014-08-28 09:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors present an extensive revision about the effectiveness of the biological treatment for rheumatoid arthritis. The paper is well written. It explores the best treatment options for patients with DMARDs failure and provides useful and practical information for clinicians involved in the care of patients with this disease.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Rheumatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12218

Title: HOW TO CHOOSE THE BEST BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS? A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Reviewer code: 00458932

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-29 16:00

Date reviewed: 2014-09-09 16:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is of interest. Since prospective studies carry more weight than retrospective studies, it would have been better if the authors included only prospective studies. There was no study on golimumab or certolizumab pegol. Therefore, the statement that adalimumab and etanercept should be used as first line agents is not supported by their data. English language also needs a bit polishing

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Rheumatology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12218

Title: HOW TO CHOOSE THE BEST BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT FOR RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS? A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Reviewer code: 00460875

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-29 16:00

Date reviewed: 2014-09-10 15:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The review/metanalysis is well done. However, I would like to draw attention of Authors on following sentence reported in abstract and conclusion that may not be clear to the reader: "Rituximab, abatacept or etanercept might be used in cases of therapeutic failure with anti-TNF agents;" because etanercept is an anti TNF agent..