Reviewer’s report

Title: Subjective patient-reported versus objective adherence to subcutaneous interferon β-1a in multiple sclerosis using RebiSmart®: the CORE study

Version: 0 Date: 11 Jul 2017

Reviewer: Adam Handel

Reviewer’s report:

The authors report a relatively small study comparing the objective vs. actual compliance of patients on IFNb. I think this does make some useful contributions to the literature but have some comments for the authors:

1) Why is the number of patients reported on here so much lower than one of the original SMART papers (http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1517/17425247.2015.1057567?journalCode=iedd20)? Is this a subgroup of the original study?

2) Could you clarify whether patients were also classified as "non-adherent" if they did not answer the question on adherence? This is not clear from the methods.

3) I don't quite understand how the category "Being well informed about features of RebiSmart" can give such a significant p-value when all categories seem almost identical. Would it be possible to produce some figures so that readers can judge the spread of the data clearly for each category of self-reported adherence?

4) "These findings support previous observations of patients reporting benefits in terms of ease of handling and comfort with RebiSmart®." This comment does not seem supportable from the data since you have no comparison group on any different treatment.

5) Did any of the patients have carers or nurses to administer the medication or did this have to be self-administered (rather than just the patient being able to do this)? This could have introduced a bias into the compliance estimates.

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:
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