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Reviewer's report:

MY COMMENTS

Abstract page

Line 6/7 (Background) - compliance and adherence used interchangeably, they connote different meaning. Line 29/30 (result) - Rephrase first statement as "A total of 195 patients were recruited. Line 32 - abbreviation CI should be inserted in front of "confidence interval"

Line 48 (conclusion) - remove "very", while the last two lines can be better rephrased, there should be consistent use of "adherence" all through

Key words: Lines 58/59, should be Cameroon, Medication adherence, Type 2 diabetes

BACKGROUND

Inadequate review of literature in paragraph 1 & 2 (Lines 3-41), Lines 30-40 needs further explanation to fit the existing literature, line 40 - statement just hanging without any meaning

Lines 44 -60 seems watery the way it is reported and can be better rephrased

2nd page of background - lines 8 -18, incorporate those statements in bracket

There is insufficient literature search and reference, occasional grammatical errors. Need to closely address all these

METHODS

Study design and setting: Line 42- replace "during" with "from". Line 48 - move "respectively" to after "Cameroon"

Sampling and study participants: Line 3-the choice of convenient sampling seems non rigorous enough to support any significance difference that may be observed because of high probability of bias in the recruitment process
Generally, very uncomfortable with the use of "We", rephrase without losing meaning. Sentence construction is poor in some instances. What inform the choice of this cut-off in line 41?

RESULTS
General characteristics- what does it means?

Is 195 representative of the Type 2 diabetes in Cameroon?. No sample size calculation to justify this.

Line 13; 175 used FBS for assessment of glycaemic control but in Table 1, 174 reported, why the discrepancy? What about drugs for other comorbid conditions reported? e.g. hypertension, CKD etc

Prevalence and reason; Rephrase line 29/30 -- as were part of the reasons cited for non-adherence

Is there no overlapping or multiple responses? How was this treated? Line 35 should be Medication Compliance Question. Line 42 -55, which direction is the significance difference?

Not clear

DISCUSSION

Two centres may not qualify as multicenter. A bit of confusion in some explanation to explain the significance difference because of issues of violation of Chi square assumption (values < 5 with variables analysed with chi-square). Limitations needs to be further expanded to include some of the gaps raised. Did the authors really sure that the study is the first in Cameroon to address this problem?

CONCLUSIONS: Line 35, violation of Chi square rule make some conclusion invalid in Table 1

Need for a table to capture response of patients to MAQ in likert scale incorporating the score categorization with cut-point

Table 1: Prevalence as part of Table 1 is not clearly reflected rather there should be another table as mentioned to address that Number of valid respondents is not equal to 195 in all cases, the valid "n" should be appropriately reflected. Under the variable "Hospital setting" 194 reported, does it means that one respondent does not belong to any hospital

Table 2, How does the author arrived at the % reported? What is the n total 106, 195, or 133? I suspect 106 was used which is not correct because categorization into adherence vrs
nonadherence was done after participants' responses have been collected. Clarify. Is there multiple response?

Table 3: not properly defined. What is "Ref"? What does all the values indicate CI, OR etc?

Table should speaks for itself

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

No

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

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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