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Reviewer’s report:

General:

The manuscript examines an important quality of care issue - patient adherence to self care tasks. This study adds to the existing literature that has shown that higher patient trust in physicians is associated with higher patient adherence, in this case to diabetic self-care tasks.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached):

The patients were not stratified based on whether they were insulin dependent or not. It would seem that this would be an important covariate in the analysis as it would likely influence the outcome variables.

I would like to know response rate for this study, it is only stated that 326 respondents in the study had information from both the telephone and chart review portions of the study. Were there differences between those who could not be reached by telephone and those who were.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors noted that a 5 point increase it the level of trust, for example, would lead to a 0.2 point decrease in self-reported hassles (about 30% of SD). For a reader, it may be difficult to interpret what clinical impact that would have. This manuscript would do well.

Also since the distribution of the trust response is skewed, it would seem to me that a 5 point increase depending on where in the distribution you start from would not translate into a similar point decrease.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
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