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Reviewer's report:

"PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: DETERMINANTS OF MONITORING ANTIHYPERTENSIVE MEDICATION ADHERENCE IN IRISH COMMUNITY PHARMACY: A FACTORIAL SURVEY

Thanks for the opportunity to re-review this manuscript.
1. There is much improvement in the manuscript compared with previous submission.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
2. Authors have admitted the need to modify the title of the study to reflect the content of the manuscript. However, the title is still largely inappropriate and unacceptable by this reviewer.

PLEASE READ THE AIM OF THE STUDY………The aim of this study was to identify facilitators and barriers to monitoring antihypertensive medication adherence of older adults at the point of repeat dispensing………………

READ ALSO THE CONCLUSION…. 

Conclusions

This survey identified that positive pharmacist attitudes and normative beliefs can facilitate adherence monitoring within the current workflow; however contextual time barriers may prevent adherence monitoring.
3. Authors should appreciate the epidemiological and research implications of the word 'DETERMINANTS'. This is a factorial survey. It assessed behavioural intention in response to hypothetical situation.

PLEASE READ THIS……. However, factorial vignettes do not test actual behaviour; rather they assess behavioural intention in response to hypothetical situations……

4. Authors should provide appropriate keywords based on journal recommendation or MeSH pattern. The provided keywords are verbose and rhetorical. Adherence is more appropriate than compliance. Authors have used consistently throughout the manuscript 'adherence' and most of the reference lists used adherence' in the published work. It is inappropriate for the authors to start arguing on appropriate use of words on medication lexicography in the current medical paradigm.

PLEASE READ AUTHORS RESPONSE TO MY QUERY…..

KEYWORDS:

i. Inappropriate and poorly written. Authors should know there is a difference between 'adherence' and 'compliance'

Yes we do know this; but not every clinician (nor researcher) understands the specific evolution of this terminology and the term compliance in fact persists in contemporaneous description of this behavioural phenomena

ii. Focus on the survey variables. Include also the survey design and site

iii. Re-cast based on journal specification or use MeSH guideline

I have expanded the key words as follows: adherence interventions, compliance, community pharmacy, factorial survey, medication adherence, medication monitoring, pharmacist attitudes, Republic of Ireland, time-pressures

5. Authors should review this comment. Just as in conclusion of a study, it is inappropriate to insert reference citations on strength of the authors study. It is not a literature review on strength of the study
PLEASE READ:

My query: Focus the strength of the study on your study findings and contribution to knowledge. Delete the references inserted in the strength of your study.

Authors response: I do not agree with deleting the references - they back up my arguments countering potential weakness in my study. A check of the current journal's most recent articles reveal most articles contain references within this subsection.

Thank you

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Title, keywords"

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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