Reviewer's report

Title: Psychotropic medication non-adherence and associated factors among adult patients with major psychiatric disorders: a protocol for a systematic review

Version: 0 Date: 19 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Mihiretu Kebede

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this protocol which aimed to estimate the level and identify determinants of psychotropic medication non-adherence among adult patients with major psychiatric disorders. The review will be an important contribution to understanding psychotropic medication adherence in low and middle-income countries. The protocol is well-written. However, there are some issues that the authors need to consider in revising this manuscript.

Revise the background section as it contains irrelevant details.

Methods: HINARI is not a search engine, it is a way to access full text for low and middle-income countries. Rather, you may consider searching literature in African Index Medicus and other sources from low and middle-income countries.

You mentioned that you will search studies before August 1st, 2017. Why? If the electronic search is already completed, it needs to be updated.

The introduction section is poorly structured and has too many redundant arguments which made it less interesting to read. Example: line 3-6, 11-14 of page 5 was already described on page 4. The same information which was described is explained again and again on subsequent pages. It needs to be shortened and restructured.

Methods: on line 13 to 15 of page 6, it was mentioned that the authors will contact potential authors in case they have publications on the topic. How do you select these people? How do you trace their profile?

The phrase "Low and middle-income countries" needs a proper definition and should be part of the keyword search.
The authors mentioned they will use AMSTAR to assess the quality of studies. AMSTAR doesn't help you here. AMSTAR is a methodological assessment tool for systematic reviews. It cannot be used for evaluating the quality of observational studies. Explore which other tools are appropriate for your research question: CASP, Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies of the NIH, Newcastle-Ottawa scale, etc.

It increases the quality of your review if two authors screen titles and abstracts and full texts independently, if not possible at least a sample of the titles and abstracts and the full texts screened by one author should be reassessed by another one. Then possibly, you can look at the level of agreement.

Consider rewriting page 10 line 1-8. It is not clear.

Page 10, line 7 to 8: please mention the criteria

Data Extraction: It is also important to extract data about the tool used to measure adherence. The tool is important if authors intend to combine estimates of adherence.

On page 11 line 7-8, the authors mentioned publication bias will be assessed by visual inspection of funnel plots based on p values less than 0.1. Visual inspection of funnel plots doesn't provide p values. On the same page, it was mentioned that if heterogeneity is high, narrative synthesis will be preferred. How high? Methodological, clinical, statistical heterogeneity?

On page 11 line 12-14, the authors mentioned they will have meta-analyzed estimates with a similar set of confounders. This is not clear. To identify determinants, will you also pool OR, RR? None of such information is described in the protocol.

Discussion: The discussion needs extensive revision. It is poor in its present form. It is a repletion of what is already written in the introduction.

Minor comments:

Microsoft Word is not a good choice for data extraction. Use excel as it offers a large volume of data collection for each study.

Change the word articles to "studies"
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