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**Reviewer’s report:**

Globally, the manuscript is interesting and well written. The question asked and the method used to answer it are clear and well described. I have no “major compulsory revisions”. However, I have few “minor essential revisions”.

**Minor essential revisions:**

1. Page 14. “Tolerability and perceived side effects... and thus affect persistence and adherence”. In reference 14, we reported that perceived side effects were associated with antihypertensive treatment discontinuation. In Gregoire et al (Can J of Cardiology 2006;22:323-329) we did not observe any association between side effects and compliance to antihypertensive treatment. If authors wish to cite reference 14, they have to delete the word “adherence”. Our main point in Gregoire 2006 was that determinants of persistence were different from those of compliance.

2. The results section is too long. The authors do not need to write almost all the information displayed in the tables.

3. Statistical testing would be necessary to support comparisons between sub-groups.

4. Table 3. Are the numbers in brackets 95% confidence interval limits?

5. It is more informative to give exact P-values than p>…

6. The authors do not specify why the results are not reported the same way for discontinuation and for the other dependent variables. In Table 4, the hazards ratios are presented for all variables included in the model (without confidence intervals). In table 3, we find only the ORs for each of the remaining dependent variables (with confidence intervals). The authors could have asses the independent variables associated not only with discontinuation but also with adherence. I suggest to add confidence intervals in Table 4 (without deleting the P-values). Moreover, the authors will have to justify why they give different information for the dependent variables or to standardize the information.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions
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