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Reviewer's report:

Major revisions

Statistical analysis:
1. The statistical analysis section needs more detail. Please describe the models you used for each outcome?

2. Please discuss in why people who self-reported sub-optimal adherence had less events than those with optimal reporting. What else was different about the two groups?

3. Handling Missing Data
Why did you choose listwise deletion for patients missing a covariate? This may introduce selection bias. Patients with missing data are often different (especially in an adherence study) than those without any missing data. Consider re-running the models without excluding those participants, use multiple imputation, or explain differences in the models between participants with and without missing data.

Minor Revisions

4. Background, pg 5, last sentence of paragraph 1—Determining which weight monitoring adherence measures are associated with HF hospitalizations could help clinicians determine optimal weight monitoring. Concluding that it will help identify higher risk patients for hospitalizations is overstating the purpose of the study, especially when HF self care training and support isn’t being offered in this study (though it may be in the parent study).

5. Pg. 10 Please include in the text (not just the figure) what covariates are adjusted for in the models. You mention including factors that were statistically different between groups or have been associated with hospitalizations before—please be explicit about which covariates fall under each category.

Discussion:

6. Our findings have potential clinical implications and suggest that diary-recorded measures of adherence may better identify optimal self-care that is associated with a reduced risk of HF-related hospitalizations than self reported recall measures.
7. Your study conclusions extend beyond the findings of the study. You are implying that diary-recorded weight adherence is a broader marker of self-care and that is why they have less HF related hospitalizations. This underlying assumption needs to be made more explicit or this conclusion should be tempered. You explain your assumption further in the discussion, but you may want to acknowledge this assumption in the introduction as well.

Discretionary Revisions

8. Pg. 11 It would be helpful to include effect sizes in the description of the results, rather than just listing variables that were associated with the outcomes.

9. In the discussion section a separate limitations subheading would be helpful.
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