Reviewer's report

Title: Physicians’ communication with patients about adherence to HIV medication in San Francisco and Copenhagen: A qualitative study using Grounded Theory.

Version: 3 Date: 21 November 2006

Reviewer: Rakhi Dandona

Reviewer's report:

General

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

1. Page 10, para 1 – Estimation of age is inappropriate. If age of the patients cannot be retrieved from the case-files, it is OK to state that age was not documented and leave it at that.

2. Page 10, para 2 – Again, it is better to leave these details out if these cannot be retrieved from the case-files.

3. Figure 1b seems more appropriate and complete than Figure 1a.

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

4. Page 4, para 2, line 3 – Please specify whose education is mentioned as a barrier.

5. Page 8, line 1 – Add “with physicians” after interviews.

6. Page 8, para 2, line 1 – Replace “participants” with “physicians”.

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

7. Page 5, para 2, line 3 – Add “patterns” after communication and replace “talk” with “discuss”.

8. Page 10, line 1 – Replace “Denmark” with “Copenhagen”.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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