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Reviewer's report:

Comments to the Author

In this study the authors evaluate the effect of an electronic diary as compared to a paper diary on a treatment adherence to interferon beta-1b in patients with multiple sclerosis.

The topic is relevant since the rate of non-adherence to the prescribed therapy in chronic disease is pretty high (up to 50%).

The authors enrolled 700 patients in the study who were offered either electronic or paper diary. The aims of the study are to evaluate the overall maintenance of treatment, the overall regularity of injections, and patient’s satisfaction and tolerability. The study is currently ongoing in the second year of the follow up. The authors report the study design and first results from baseline assessments.

Major Compulsory Revisions

I have no major comments.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Abstract
Abbreviation PDA/PD should be explained already when first used.

2. Introduction
This section would benefit from some shortening.

3. Methods
a. Spelling mistake – Page 5: „The handling of the PDA was be explained by the physician…..“ Delete ‚be‘.

b. 6 lines bellow „….a diary function and help function (where information about the administration of IFN beta -1b is provided. …end parenthesis ,)‘ is missing.

c. Page 6: abbreviation „NIS“ should be explained.

4. Results – it is confusing that authors describe 700 hundred enrolled patients but mention baseline demographic in only 496 females and 201 males, the same with CIS (35) or RR (662) status and PD (317) or PDA (383) assignement. Althought the authors explain these discrepancies in the Statistics section (that
this is an interim analyses), once they report their first data, it should be clarified in more details how much data is missing and why.

5. Conclusion

a. Spelling mistake – 1st line …a large sample of MS patients with a a relatively short… Delete ‘a’
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