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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor

Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised manuscript coded BEND-D-17-00244R1

Comments: There have been significant improvements in the manuscript. However, I have some minor corrections and comments for the author to clarify as highlighted below:

Background

Line 19-27: The sentences does not still flow very well, author should closely look at it again and consider rephrasing it. Especially, the way it reads towards the end of that sentence --------------i.e. with still large burden in these countries-----

Method

Under sampling and study participants: Line 32, authors should use only "consecutive sampling" and not convenience consecutive sampling ------------------------
Under assessment of non-adherence: Line 15/16: ------- after Morisky Medication Adherence Scale ----------- reference is required. Also, Line 18/19: ---- previous published studies 21 ------- - there should be more than a single reference. In addition, sentences from Lines 15 to 21 can be better adjusted

Results

The results are better presented now except some issues with the Tables which will be pointed out under comments on Tables below

Discussion: There is significant improvement

Tables
Table 1: Line 38, 46, 51, 57 etc the columns labelled with the word "Missing" are not supposed to be included in such a manner rather the valid responses for each variable to be indicated by "n" should be inserted in front of each variable e.g. for variable tagged "Number of diabetes complication (n = ?), ditto for others. With this the percent response will be easily captured by the reader.

Table 2: In this table, the total number of response is 133 i.e. n total. Ideally, number for each option should be n/n total multiply by 100 e.g. if n = 59, then the calculation should read 59 divided by 133 multiply by 100%. With this, the total percentage will add up to 100% rather than 68.1% in the table. I suggest that the author redo the table in this manner.

Table 3: The author should create a column for the scoring and the categorization with appropriate remarks e.g score ≥ 27, remark = Adherence; score < 27 , remark = non-adherence. However, the scores assigned to each likert option should be inserted as footnote to the table, the same way it is reflected and stated in the method. I noticed that the Likert scale options in Table 3 are quite different from what was described in the method under assessment of adherence. Author needs to reconcile this and use the options that were exactly used to elicit response from the patients during data collection.

There are two Tables labelled as table 3. The table with the title "Factors associated with non-adherence --------------------------- should be captured as Table 4

Table 4 seems confusing, however, it will be more appealing if the author can represent it in a clearer way. See the table below as a guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>0.44 (0.25-0.78)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.25-0.94)</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author should remove "ref" from the table, I don't think it will be useful anymore if the CI is well presented as in the sample above

Once the author address all these shortcomings, the manuscript will be much better

Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised manuscript

Dr R. Adisa
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.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare I have no competing interests in relation to this paper

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal