

Review of: "Antihypertensive Medications Adherence and Its Relationship to Blood Pressure Control Among Healthcare Workers in Jose R. Reyes Memorial Medical Center (JRRMMC): A Retrospective Analytic Study"

Cheong Lieng Teng¹

¹ International Medical University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

An interesting paper describing medication adherence among health personnel in a Filipino hospital.

Some comments for the authors to consider:

1. Background. No need to capitalize words that are not proper nouns (e.g. "Occupational Diseases", "Workforce")
2. Background. "The topmost work-related disease suffered by workers was back pain with 31.3%. Other most prevalent occupational diseases experienced were essential hypertension and neck-shoulder pains." This two sentences need reference.
3. Background. "The number of deaths from hypertension-related cardiovascular disease is more than 10 times greater than that from industrial accidents." This sentence need a reference.
4. Background. "[9][10][11][12][13][14]". May be better to write [9-14]. Other similar instances elsewhere as well.
5. Methods. "The self-reported questionnaires were administered to hospital workers and blood pressure was measured with the aid of an automatically validated device, at least two consecutive times." Probably incorrect to write "administered". Not clear how blood pressure is measured in this retrospective study (who it based on database records?)
6. Methods. "A local study done by Encabo, et. al (2017) study used an 11-item questionnaire patterned from the 8-item Morisky and other questionnaires about medication adherence." "Patterned" is unclear, may need language editing.
7. Methods. "Data were typed in Excel and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)." The current name of SPSS is "IBM SPSS Statistical Software" need to state the version number.
8. Methods. No mention of the threshold for classifying medication adherence using MMAS-8. "[29][30][31][32][33][34]" quoted as references for MMAS-8, probably some of them are irrelevant. Ref30 is American College of Cardiology CPG on hypertension, why quoted here? Ref 32-33 are non-english references, need to translate article title into English, do check their relevance.
9. Methods. No mention of the threshold for classifying blood pressure control (apparent; $\leq 140/90$ mmHg as seen in the Result section). Need a reference on this, preferably a Filipino clinical practice guideline. Somewhere an old Philippines CPG on hypertension in the year 2013 was mentioned. Apparently there is a more current CPG, see below: Ona DID, Jimeno CA, Jasul GV Jr, Bunyi MLE, Oliva R, Gonzalez-Santos LE, Mercado-Asis LB, Luz VA, Leus

AG, Diaz ABF, Santos MI, Belen AA, Bonzon DD, Bote-Nunez J, Cawed-Mende RMN, Chua AS, Javier AMJT, Juangco DNA, Madrigal-Dy C, Manicad MB, Ortiz JMGR, Padolina CS, Sison MCC, Villanueva NJ. Executive summary of the 2020 clinical practice guidelines for the management of hypertension in the Philippines. *J Clin Hypertens (Greenwich)*. 2021 Sep;23(9):1637-1650. doi: 10.1111/jch.14335

10. Methods. Multiple logistic regression need justification and more details.
11. Results. Table row probably need different shading of row for clarity.
12. Results. Tables 6&7 probably can combine, consider adding category for both <140/90.
13. Results. Table 8: p(X²), CI95% are unclear. 95% is not a subscript.
14. Discussion. Need more pertinent Filipino references, e.g., Gutierrez MM, Sakulbumrungsil R. Factors associated with medication adherence of hypertensive patients in the Philippines: a systematic review. *Clin Hypertens*. 2021 Oct 1;27(1):19. doi: 10.1186/s40885-021-00176-0;
15. Discussion. Need more pertinent Filipino references, e.g., Areceo LP, Buan E, Neri R, et al. Philippine Heart Association–Council on Hypertension report on survey of hypertension and target organ damage (Presyon 2-TOD*): a report on prevalence of hypertension, awareness, treatment profile and control rate. *Philippine Journal of Cardiology*. 2007;35(1):1-9
16. Discussion. “The rate of hypertensive individuals found in this study among nursing professionals was 42.00%” Statement is merely a percentage, not reflecting hypertension being more common among nurses (may be more nursing personnel in this hospital, compared to other staff).
17. References. Ref 1, unnecessary information in square brackets: *Am J Ind Med*[Internet]. 2010 [cited 2017 Feb 16]; other similar instances elsewhere.