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The Editor
BMC Health Service Research

Dear Editor,

Re: Resubmission of manuscript MS: 9384133211326114 titled Adherence to anti diabetic medication among patients with diabetes in eastern Uganda; a cross sectional study

We are pleased to resubmit our manuscript entitled: “Adherence to anti diabetic medication among patients with diabetes in eastern Uganda; a cross sectional study”. We thank the reviewers for the constructive and supportive comments. Below is a point by point response to the reviewers’ comments.

Point by point response to reviewers’ comments

Reviewer 1: Jayadevan Sreedharan

Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions on page 4, mentioned numerous studies but only one reference is mentioned

We thank the reviewer this comment and we added more references to qualify the first sentence second paragraph on page 4. There are now three references:


“We used non-critical and non-threatening questions to minimize on the potential recall and response biases”. Meaning?

This is a good comment. We agree with the reviewer that the meaning of the statement is not clear. We intended to mean that we asked questions that were not criticizing patients not intimidating them in case they were not adhering to medication. However in the context, the statement seems to be out of place and we have deleted it as indicated on p.6.

“We considered patients who took 80% and above of the prescribed doses over the last seven days as adherent to anti diabetic drugs [12, 22, 27].” If this is your operation definition, please write under difference subheading and give reference number

We appreciate this comment and the operational definition of “adherence” has been put under a different sub heading on page 6.

Reviewer 2: Mary Justin-Temu
1. The questions posed by the authors were well defined.
2. The Methods used in the study are appropriate and well described
3. The data collected for analysis are quite sound and good
4. The data shown on tables reflect the data collected as analysed.
5. The manuscript is in order

We thank the reviewer for the encouraging comments above.
6. The discussion need to be more elaboration especially the Confidence interval must be clarified so that readers can tell the significance of the values like level f adherence, taken medication for more than three years etc.

We thank the reviewer for this comment. We have indicated the confidence intervals in the discussion as can be seen on p. 9 last paragraph, p. 10 second paragraph and p. 11 first paragraph.

The conclusions are OK.
7. The limitations of the study are clearly stated
8. The authors have acknowledged those key people who made this work be published.
9. The title and the abstract reflect very well the whole researched work results

We appreciate these comments from the reviewer.
10. The work is acceptable with minor correction including some clarifications in the discussion, topographical errors

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Elizeus Rutebemberwa
Corresponding author
Department of Health Policy Planning and Management
Makerere University School of Public Health, College of Health sciences, Kampala Uganda
P O Box 7072 Kampala Uganda
Mulago Hospital Complex
Email: ellie@musph.ac.ug
Phone: +256 700 720077