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Reviewer’s report:

General

This paper reviews the prevalence and correlates/determinants of non-adherence to phosphate binding medications in patients with end-stage renal disease. This paper is well written and methodological sound.

Following elements could be taken into consideration by the authors to further strengthen the paper

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

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

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

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

# The authors did an extensive literature review of different databases to identify relevant papers for their study. It seems as they have not included the study with the largest sample in their review i.e. the adherence part of the Dialysis Outcomes Practice and Patterns Study (Saran et al., Kidney Int. 2003; 64: 254-262)

# A recent adherence study regarding adherence was presented at the EDTNA conference in Barcelona by M Elseviers of the University of Antwerp (B) (PI monique.elseviers@ua.ac.be). Perhaps the PI can be contacted to inquire if these findings are already in press and can be included in this review

# It is not clear which framework the authors used to organize the correlates/determinants. An increasingly used framework is of WHO (Sabate, WHO report). Using this framework the authors will also notice that one set of correlates has not been addressed in their review, i.e. health care provider and health care system related factors. In the DOPPS adherence study some system factors were identified that also should be part of this review.

# P. 8: What do the authors mean with patient’s transplant history?

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

# Did the authors attempted to use meta-analytic techniques to answer their research aim? (See Dew MA, DiMartini AF, De Vito Dabbs A, Myaskovsky L, Steel J, Unruh M, et al. Rates and risk factors for nonadherence to the medical regimen after adult solid organ transplantation. Transplantation 2007;83(7):858-73.)

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

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.