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Reviewer's report:

"My comments below relate to the authors' responses to the separate paragraphs from reviewer 3.

1. "After a goodly amount of hemming and hawing..."
The authors make a good case in their response for the validity and usefulness of the patient information methods (collected from contemporaneous notes and later interview). These points do not appear with the same clarity in the paper. I would suggest that they
a) break up and better structure the very long para on p7/8 in which these are described
b) include a brief comment on the validity of these methods in the discussion
c) consider explicit mention of these two methods in the abstract

2. "The field of adherence research..."
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable

3. "There is no indication in the present paper..."
The authors' response finishes "We showed that an intervention effect may occur" and this is true. But it would seem reasonable to ask them to include brief mention of this possible limitation in the discussion.

4. "From where comes..."
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable

5. "As far as the trend..."
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable
6. "The authors should acknowledge..."
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable.

7. "The question of observer bias..."
As mentioned above under #3, it would be reasonable to ask the authors to include brief mention of this possible limitation in the discussion. The fact that this 'does not diverge from standard practice' explains what they have done, but does not of course eliminate possible biases.

8. "The authors should acknowledge that the website..."
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable.

9. "The authors should acknowledge that the MEMS..."
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable.

10. Minor essential revisions
I think the authors' response to and handling of these points is reasonable.

Overall, I found this an interesting paper; the first version was welcomed by most of the reviewers; and (leaving reviewer 3 to one side for the moment) the authors seem to have responded well to the reviewers' comments. With respect to reviewer 3, my overall view is that, with a few further changes as suggested above, the authors will have responded well also to this reviewer's comments. It would then seem desirable for publication to proceed speedily."