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Reviewer's report:

Major problems - The Morisky-Green-Levine questionnaire was designed as a screening test for adherence, not as a "gold standard" tool for research purposes. As the article states, it has ab 81% sensitivity and only a 44% sensitivity. The authors must adress why this method can be applied to their research question when it has such a low sensitivity. Generally the questionnaire is scored 1 for each no response and a score of 3-4 is considered good adherence. Why did the authors reverse the accepted scoring? Why did the authors only consider 0 as high adherence when most articles use scores of 3 and 4 for as being considered good adherence?

Minor-

1 The English throughout the article needs correcting.

2 Please describe how the 2 sites chosen are representative of primary health care clinics throughout Spain

3 Why did you choose 75% adherance levels for the sampling population when in the conclusion you bring a number of papers with 50% adherance rates

4 Were the various questionnaires validated in Spanish?

5 Eligible subjects were aged 18 and older, yet the youngest subject interviewed was 52, is this representative?

6 Should "medium adherence rates " be included in the "poor adherance" group?

7As this was a cross sectional study, association can be implied NOT prediction, please correct throughout the article.
8 "Prevalance rate" is not the correct term, please rewrite the sentences that talk about prevalence to adherence

9 The MORISKY-Green-Levine questionnaire is a good screening tool with 81% specificity, but as a research tool to confirm compliance it is weak with a 44% sensitivity

10 Table 1 and 2 can be combined.

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.

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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