Author's response to reviews

Title: Effects of and satisfaction with Short Message Service reminders for patient medication adherence: A randomized controlled study

Authors:

Hsiu-Ling Huang (hmling88@gmail.com)
Yu-Chuan (Jack) Li (jack@tmu.edu.tw)
Yueh-Ching Chou (ycchou@tmu.edu.tw)
Yow-Wen Hsieh (yowen@mail.cmu.edu.tw)
Frank Kuo (d94725010@ntu.edu.tw)
Sinkuo Daniel Chai (skchai@mail.cmu.edu.tw)
Blossom Yen-Ju Lin (yenjulin@mail.cmu.edu.tw)
Chia-Jung Chuang (wctsai2011@gmail.com)
Wen-Chen Tsai (wtsai@mail.cmu.edu.tw)
Pei-Tseng Kung (ptkung@asia.edu.tw)

Version: 5 Date: 8 November 2013

Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor:

We are resubmitting a revised paper entitled “Effects of and satisfaction with Short Message Service reminders for patient medication adherence: A randomized controlled study” according to the editor’s suggestion. We have followed the reviewers’ comments to correct our manuscript. We also have sent our manuscript to the professional company (Edanz) for English editing according to the editorial office’s suggestion. The following pages are our replies to reviewers’ comments. We have marked with red color for our any changes in the revised manuscript.

We hope that you will consider our article for publication and look forward to hearing from you. Please let us know if any minor revisions are needed.

Sincerely yours,

Wen-Chen Tsai, Dr.PH
Professor
Department of Health Service Administration, China Medical University, 91, Hsueh-Shih Road, Taichung, Taiwan, 40402 ROC.
Tel.: +886 422073070；fax：+886 422028895
E-mail addresses: wtsai@mail.cmu.edu.tw
Reviewer: Brian Suffoletto

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions: Once again, the writing has not been translated appropriately to be understandable. Please find someone who can translate.
Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have sent our manuscript to the professional company (Edanz) for English editing according to the editorial office’s suggestion.

Reviewer: Thyra E de Jongh

Reviewer's report:

Overall, the authors have adequately addressed the comments raised in previous rounds of reviewing. The writing has also noticeably improved with editing. I just have some minor -though some essential- comments that I trust the authors can address without further need for review.

Minor essential revisions:

Final sentence of the abstract (conclusion): Revise "A daily SMS should ..." to "A daily SMS could ..."
Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have adjusted it in page 4.

In the background section it is unclear why the sentence "However, certain studies have noted ..." would have to start on the word "however". This is not a juxtaposition to, but rather an elaboration of the previous sentence. The next sentence also comments on positive effects though. Please check how this paragraph was intended and rewrite accordingly.
Ans: We have rewritten accordingly in the sentence in page 6. Thank you for your suggestion.

Also in the background section: you state that you "studied the effectiveness of SMS reminders as a pharmaceutical intervention". The word pharmaceutical implies use of medication, which is not the case. Please revise.
Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have adjusted the words in page 6.

Results: on page 14 you state "These findings suggest that SMS medication reminders
effectively improved the incidence of delayed and missed doses." You mean that it REDUCED the incidence (as pointed out by one of the other reviewers as well).

Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have corrected it in page 14.

Discussion: on page 1 you write that "senior patients can be stubborn and are likely to stop using medication based on personal decisions." I find the choice for use of the word 'stubborn' rather unfortunate as this has a very judgmental connotation. Perhaps something a little more neutral like "senior patients are often more resistant to behavior change" could be used. In the following sentence you state that they may be "unfamiliar" with cell phones. This is at odds with the fact they you have used ability to receive and read text messages as an inclusion criteria! I would rephrase to something less strong e.g. "less familiar".

Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have adjusted them in page 18.

Discussion: the paragraph stating "This could be because, compared with unemployed patients, the military personnel, civil servants, teachers, and students were typically young or middle-aged adults who demonstrated relatively better health conditions; therefore, unemployed patients considered long-term medication unnecessary" does not make sense. If anything, the SECOND group would consider long-term medication less necessary than the unemployed group. Probably something went wrong here in the editing process. Please check and adjust if necessary.

Ans: Thank you for your valued suggestion. We have corrected it in page 19.

p.20: poo adherence = poor adherence!

Ans: We have corrected it in page 20. Thank you.

Discussion: I have not previously commented on this as I hoped that the English editing would soften the wording but the explanation that married women who are housekeepers "lacked work stress, had time to care for themselves, and may already have been adhering to their medication satisfactorily" shows some real male bias against this group. I am sure that many of these women would argue their lives are at least as stressful as those of their husbands. Please consider rephrasing this.

Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have reworded the sentence in page 21.

Limitations: The sentence "Many studies have shown that medication adherence outcome data are purely reliant on self-reporting, generating a high likelihood of reporting bias" is incorrect. It should read: "Many studies have shown that medication
adherence outcome data that are purely reliant on self-reporting have a high likelihood of reporting bias."

Ans: Thank you for your suggestion. We have adjusted it in page 22.

Conclusion: You still mention a "greater improvement in the incidence...". You mean reduction in the incidence.
Ans: We have corrected it in page 23. Thank you for your suggestion.

Reviewer: Marcia Vervloet

Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed all issues. I have no further comments.
Ans: Thank you.