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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript presents the methods and results for a (scoping) systematic review examining adherence to antihypertensive medication in Russia. I was asked for an open peer review report and I interpret that to include all aspects of the design and reporting of the methods and results.

Overall, this appears to be a well-developed study. There are certain areas (abstract, methods and results) where additional clarity may be necessary to improve the transparency of the study.

My comments are mainly requests for details and clarification.

Comments

Authors seem to report a scoping review (not a systematic review) on levels, determinants and intervention strategies of adherence to antihypertension medication in Russia. Scoping reviews, follow a systematic approach to map and synthetize evidence on a topic and identify main concepts, sources and knowledge gaps. Please report your study following the recent PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (and include in Additional file 1 a populated checklist of PRISMA-ScR, instead of PRISMA).

More information here: http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/ScopingReviews

Title

Page 1. Please, identify the report as a scoping review.

Abstract

Page 2. Background and objectives. Please, provide a brief statement of the objective(s) being addressed with their reference to their key elements (e.g. participants, concepts and context) used to conceptualize the questions. For example where (p.2 lines 5 and 6): "This is the first
systematic review of Russian studies on adherence to antihypertensive therapy, as reported in the Russian language literature", could be "The present study undertakes a scoping review of research on adherence to antihypertensive medication in Russia to determine the extent research has been undertaken, the prevalence levels of adherence among adults diagnosed with arterial hypertension, the methodologies used and whether they are sufficient in describing determinants and intervention strategies".

Page 2. Methods. Please, report eligibility criteria, sources of evidence (including databases with dates of coverage, but also date last searched), charting methods, critical appraisal, etc. according to PRISMA-ScR statement.

Page 2. Results. Some statements are somewhat uninformative (e.g. "Only 7 studies were randomized" (examining what: intervention strategies? adherence?); or "There was considerable heterogeneity of patients included in non-randomized trials"). Please report total number of studies by breaking down study question 1) adherence, 2) determinants and 3) intervention strategies and study design. Please, revise this subsection.

Page 2. Conclusions. Please, provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and methods, as well as potential next steps. For example, authors mentions "poor quality" of observational studies, and "high quality" of experimental studies, but did not report methods and results for these findings.

Background

Page 3. Please, explain why the (scoping) review question/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach. Some of the information in the fourth paragraph (lines 28-46) is valid. Please, replace the term "systematic review" by "scoping review" through the paper (e.g. line 29).

Methods.

Page 4. Please, indicate whether a ScR protocol exists, state if and where it can be accessed (e.g. Web address, Additional file for this manuscript,…)

Page 4. The authors' state: "The review was conducted according to PRISMA guidelines [8]". In my opinion, the authors should rephrase the text in order to clarify they used reporting guidance by PRISMA statement or extensions. To clarify, PRISMA is not intended to be prescriptive about how systematic reviews and meta-analyses should be conducted/performed or interpreted. Instead, PRISMA seeks to provide reporting guidance on important information to be included in reports of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
Please, indicate you have reported your methods and results following PRISMA-ScR (for example: "This scoping review was reported in accordance with the reporting guidance provided in the PRISMA statement extension for scoping reviews [include reference] (see checklist in Additional file 1)."


Page 4. Eligibility criteria. Please, report eligible study designs e.g. randomized controlled trials and observational studies (cross-sectional, cohort studies). Please, provide a rationale for limits used "years considered (after January 1st)", and "Russian language (not English?)".

Page 4 and 5. Information sources and search strategy. Please, describe all information sources in the search (databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as update the most recent search executed in 2017. Please, present the full electronic search strategies as supplementary material, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.

Page 6 and 7. Data extraction. Please, list and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made, including full definitions of "adherence" and "determinants of adherence", but also full descriptions (and examples) of eligible interventions to improve adherence.

Page 7. Study quality/critical appraisal of individual studies. If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal (quality assessment) of included studies; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate). Please, see my comments on Abstract/conclusions.

Page 8. Synthesis of results. The authors' state: "Because of the many weakness and limitations in the studies included it was not appropriate to perform a formal meta-analysis. Instead, we have provided a systematic narrative summary of the key aspects of the findings of the studies". In my opinion, this statement should be replaced by a clear description of the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted. For example: "We grouped the studies by the study questions they analyzed (adherence, determinants and interventions), and summarized the type of settings, populations and study designs for each question, along with the measures used and broad findings. The results of this scoping review were synthesized using both a numerical summary outlining the relevant characteristics of the included studies and a narrative synthesis interpreting the results".
Results

Page 8-12. If done, present data on critical appraisal/study quality assessment of included sources of evidence (some information in p.12 could be relevant for this).

Page 12. Please, if the scoping review (re)presents amendments of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes (e.g. documenting important protocol amendments in Additional file/webappendix). Please, clarify.

Discussion

Page 12. As per PRISMA-ScR, please, summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.

Page 15. Limitations. Please, discuss the limitations of the scoping review process (e.g. last search dated 2017, only literature in Russian?).

Page 15. Please, provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.

Tables

See comments above (Methods and Results). Please, report measures used and broad findings at study level. Please, report critical appraisal/quality assessment findings at study level.

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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 that I have no competing interests.

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

Do you want to get recognition for reviewing this manuscript? Add a record of this review to Publons to track and showcase your reviewing expertise across the world’s journals. Signing up is quick, easy and free!

Yes