Author's response to reviews

Title: Factors Affecting Medication Adherence: Patient Perspectives from Five Veterans Affairs Facilities

Authors:

Clarissa Hsu (hsu.c@ghc.org)
Jaclyn M Lemon (lemonj@u.washington.edu)
Edwin S Wong (edwin.wong@va.gov)
Elizabeth Carson-Cheng (eli_carson@yahoo.com)
Mark Perkins (mark.perkins2@va.gov)
Margaret S. Nordstrom (margaretnordstrom@gmail.com)
Chuan-Fen Liu (Chuan-Fen.Liu@va.gov)
Carol Sprague (carol.sprague@va.gov)
Christopher L. Bryson (Christopher.Bryson@va.gov)

Version: 4 Date: 14 October 2014

Author's response to reviews:

Dear Ms. Valencia,

Thank you so much for your feedback. We are pleased that the reviewers feel that all their issues were addressed. We also appreciate the editor's comments and have reviewed and addressed those in this version of the manuscript. Below is a detailed explanation of how we addressed each comment that required revision to the paper.

Please let me know if we can do anything further to ensure that the paper meets the specifications and requirements of your journal

Thank you again for your consideration and patience.

Sincerely,

Clarissa Hsu, PhD
Group Health Research Institute
Center for Community Health and Evaluation
1730 Minor Ave, Suite 1600
Seattle, WA 98101
206-287-4276
Hsu.c@ghc.org
Reviewer 1

Reviewer: charu grover

Reviewer's report:
All the concerns raised have been addressed

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:
'I declare that I have no competing interests'

We are pleased that we were able to address all of the reviewers concerns.

Editor Comments

Please make the following formatting changes during revision of your manuscript. Ensuring that the manuscript meets the journal's manuscript structure will help to speed the production process if your manuscript is accepted for publication.

1. RATS guidelines

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#StandardsofReporting), could you please ensure your manuscript reporting adheres to RATS guidelines (http://www.biomedcentral.com/authors/rats) for reporting qualitative studies. This is so your methodology can be fully evaluated and utilized.

I reviewed the RATS guidelines line by line to ensure that our manuscript addressed all the guideline components. The following details my assessment of each component, including what I added to the manuscript to ensure that our manuscript meets these guidelines.

Relevance: Covered in background section

Appropriate use of qualitative methods: Added the following sentences on pg 7 to explain rationale for choosing focus groups over other types of data collection
methods (i.e. interviews): Focus groups were chosen in order to increase the diversity of opinions we were able to gather. The focus group approach also allowed us to explore if there were common issues raised at particular sites and by the low adherence versus high adherence patients.

Transparency of procedures: Covered in detail in the methods section

Recruitment: Covered in detail in the methods section

Data collection: Covered in detail in the methods section

Roles of researchers: Added the following sentences on pg 9 to clarify the roles of the research team: Most of the staff working on the focus groups were professional research staff and did not occupy dual roles in research and care delivery. The one exception was the Principal Investigator who also provides clinical care, however none of his patients were involved in the focus groups.

Ethics: Largely covered but added the following sentence on pg 9 to address issues of confidentiality: All participants reviewed and signed a written informed consent form before participating which discussed issues of confidentiality; including that fact their names would not be associated with any quotes used.

Also made revision to the statement regarding ethics/IRB review and approval, see below.

Soundness of interpretive approach (analysis): Covered in detail in data analysis section.

Discussion and presentation: Covered in the discussion section of the paper.

Red flags: In my opinion our paper does not have any of the red flags mentioned.

2. Please add the full name and affiliation of all the ethics committee that approved the study to the Methods section.

We revised the statement about ethics committee review to include the names and affiliations of all the committees that reviewed our research protocols.

Pg 9: The methods and procedures for this study were reviewed by the Institutional Review Boards at each of the clinic sites where focus groups were conducted:1) Veteran Affairs Puget Sound Health Care System, Office of
Research & Development, Veteran Affairs Puget Sound Human Research Protection Program, 2) South Texas Veterans Health Care System Institutional Review Board, 3) Portland Veteran Affairs Medical Center Institutional Review Board. All protocols were also reviewed by the institutions where key personnel were located: 1) Group Health Research Institute’s Institutional Review Board and 2) the University of Washington’s Human Subjects Division.