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June 16th, 2010

The Editor
BioMed Central Psychiatry

Dear Sir/Madam:

We have addressed the reviewer's comments in the revised manuscript entitled “Adherence to antidepressant therapy for major depressive patients in a psychiatric hospital in Thailand”. It contains 2195 words (excluding abstract and references), 27 references and 3 Tables. Please also see the point-by-point response to the concerns attached.

Thank you for your consideration. I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Benjamas Prukkanone, M.D.

Enclosures: a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments (3 pages)
Reviewer's report

Title: Adherence to antidepressant therapy for major depressive patients in a psychiatric hospital in Thailand

Version: 2 Date: 16 May 2010

Reviewer: Churn-Shiouh Gau

Reviewer's report:
Basically the authors have tried hard to response reviewers' comments making some major corrections. Especially, the authors have restructured and recalculate the data for Table 3. However the data presented in Table 3, especially on column 3, are very confusion as they were in previous version.

1. In this study, the authors have defined “Adherence” in two levels, i.e., the “MPR” value for each patient, which was calculated according to the definition in literature; and the “adherent” vs. “non-adherent”, the patients were recognized as “adherent” if their MPR values were greater than 0.8 otherwise they were defined to be “non-adherent”. The data in Column 3 “%Adherent” of Table 3 presenting the percentage of patients with MPR values greater than 0.8 in each subgroup, therefore it is possible to calculate to know that there are 59 patients with MPR values greater than 0.8 in the 195 patients who received only one drug. If this is the case, what’s the meaning of (95% CI) in Column 3? How the data of 95% CI in Column were generated?

Response: We calculated confidence intervals around proportion of people who are adherent using the formula se=sqrt(p(1-p)/n) which for sample sizes greater than 100 is a good approximation of the binomial distribution around a proportion (see Kirkwood B (1988): Essentials of medical statistics. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications’).

2. Following above calculation, the total number of patients who have MPR values greater than 0.8 should be 241, therefore, the number 260 shown in the 2nd line of last paragraph of page 5 should be wrong. Please correct it.

Response: We have corrected it. However, the number should be 243, the sum of 58, 81 and 104. Please see the changes in the first line of second paragraph on page 5 in the manuscript.

3. It will be very helpful for the discussion on the reason why the total adherence was as low as 23% if the authors analyzed the depressant diagnosis for patients
those who had the antidepressant prescription only once.

**Response:** Please see in the discussion section at first paragraph on page 8 in the manuscript (yellow highlighted text). We stated this explanation in the text: “As mentioned previously, most non-adherent patients in our study received only one prescription in this hospital and we do not know if these patients received subsequent prescriptions at other facilities. For this reason these patients were excluded from the MPR calculation”

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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

**Comments from the Associate Editor:**

> Throughout the manuscript, occurrences of “anti-depressant” should be changed to “antidepressant”

**Response:** Please see the changes in three points which are (1) Page 4, first paragraph of results, line 2; (2) Page 5, under Table 2; and (3) Page 7, second paragraph, line 1.

> Page 8 last line sentence “Those calculation…” Should be changed to “For this reason these patients were excluded from the MPR calculation”

**Response:** Please see the changes in Page 8, first paragraph, last line.

> Page 9 line 2 consists of

**Response:** Please see the changes in Page 8, second paragraph, line 2.

> Page 9 line 10 hospitals

**Response:** Please see the changes in Page 8, third paragraph, last line.

> Page 9 line 15 related to < and for next occurrence> related

**Response:** Please see the changes in Page 8, last paragraph, line 5.

> Page 9 line 16 delete “such as” and replace with “include”
Response: Please see the changes in Page 8, last paragraph, line 6.

> Page 9 line 19 delete “and explanation from doctors” and replace with “including doctor-patient communication”

Response: Please see the changes in Page 8, last paragraph, line 9.

> Page 9 line 22 delete space after “once” and delete “These” and replace with “Such studies”

Response: Please see the changes in Page 8, last paragraph, last line.