

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"

Wondwossen Yimam

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Manuscript DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.32388/OT2LN1>

Title of paper:

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

Reviewer Comments:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript entitled 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.

This paper is valid not only for Philippine but also for other countries. Therefore, this paper brings to the attention of health managers or relevant health institutions what they should consider when they want to undertake the establishment of structures for the Healthcare Workers.

The topic is interesting; however, there are some modifications to improve the manuscript

Title and abstract

1. Do the title and abstract cover the main aspect of the work?

Yes, however your title is not consistent with your specific objectives. Hence consider revision as it is suggested below

Suggestion:

A/ Title

Antihypertensive Medications Adherence and Determinants among Healthcare Workers in Jose R. Reyes Memorial Medical Center (JRRMMC).

B/ General objective

To assess antihypertensive medications adherence and determinants among healthcare workers in Jose R. Reyes Memorial Medical Center

Specific objectives

1. To determine antihypertensive medications adherence among healthcare workers in Jose R. Reyes Memorial Medical Center
2. To examine determinants of antihypertensive medications adherence among healthcare workers in Jose R. Reyes Memorial Medical Center

Keywords

Suggestion:

I suggest arranging keywords based on alphabetical orders as below:

Antihypertensive drugs, Healthcare workers Medication adherence,

Background

2. Does the introduction provide background and information relevant to the study?

Yes, but it needs revision

Suggestion:

A/ Please follow logical order (global to local perspectives) when you write about the level of Antihypertensive Medications Adherence (Example. Global----- Asia ----- South-East Asia --- Philippine)

B/Similarly, Please follow logical order (global to local perspectives) when you write about the magnitude of hypertension (Example. Global----- Asia ----- South-East Asia --- Philippine)

C/Please properly acknowledge sources with references.

Example. There are no references for the following

1/ Page 2: Hypertension ranked as number 2 out of the top 5 Occupational Diseases among the Philippine Workforce⁽¹⁾. 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 ⁽¹⁾.

2/ Page 3: Barriers to drug adherence include complex medication regimens, dosing frequency, behavioral factors, and side effects⁽¹⁾.

3/ The most typical barriers are under the patient's control, including knowledge and attitudes toward medications⁽¹⁾.

D/ Please attach the your conceptual framework just above the research objective

E/ Could you explain what is known about your topic, and what your paper added?

Material and Methods

1. Are the methods clear and replicable? Do all the results presented match the methods described?

Yes, but it is good to incorporate the procedures that have been carried out to ensure the quality of the data, exclusion criteria, operational definitions (example, Good medication adherence VS poor medication adherence, Hypercholesterolemia: Yes Vs No, Blood pressure measurement: Good control Vs poor control)

Suggestions

A/ Please attach the permission letter that you obtained from the owner of the tool (Morisky Medication Adherence Scale) as a supplementary material, unless otherwise you will be liable with the creative common license issue.

B/ Please attach the permission letter you obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) committee

Study design

A Retrospective Analytic Study Vs Cross sectional study

Suggestion

I think your study design is not correct this is b/se to conduct a retrospective study you have to review at least a five years record/profile/ of health care workers. Hence, please consult a statistician for its appropriateness.

Results

4. If relevant are the results novels? Does the study provide an advance in the field? Is the data plausible?

The results were on the whole clear or would have been if I had had a better understanding of the tools used (see above)

Suggestions

Please be focused to your specific objectives

A/ Please report the response rate at the beginning of the result section

B/ Please show the level of Antihypertensive Medications Adherence with a Pie /Bar graph to address your second specific objective

C/ Page 12, Table 9, the inferential table is totally incorrect

Please export your independent variables to multivariable logistic regression model and examine whether your independent variables have significant association or no significant association with the dependent variable by comparing

their AOR, CI or P values.

Example. Please look at the following inferential table

Variables	Category	Adherence		COR (95%)	AOR (95%)	P- value
		Good	Poor			
Sex	Male	78	113	1.3(0.88-1.92)	0.9(0.56- 1.51)	0.791
	Female	108	120	1	1	
Distance from health facility	< 1Km	63	102	1	1	
	1-4 Km	119	111	3.1(1.0-9.45)	3.4(0.90-12.78)	0.071
	≥4 km	04	20	5.4(1.8-9.32)	4.9(1.33-10.35)	0.017*
Residence	Rural	37	124	0.2(0.14-0.34)	0.3(0.17-0.40)	0.001**
	Urban	149	101	1	1	
Educational Status	Illiterate	36	122	4.6(2.93-7.15)	5.9 (3.40-10.32)	0.001**
	Literates	150	111	1	1	
Self-care adherence	Good	101	92	1	1	
	Poor	85	141	1.8(1.23-2.69)	1.8(1.14-3.07)	0.013*
Depression	Normal	140	205	1	1	
	Mild	22	19	1.7(0.90-3.25)	0.6(0.32-1.20)	0.159
	Moderate	19	08	3.5(1.48-8.17)	7.3(4.10-11.5)	0.02*
	Severe	05	01	7.3(0.80-10.30)	3.6(2.24-12.94)	0.355
Anxiety	Normal	139	124	1	1	
	Mild	35	58	0.5(0.33-0.87)	0.6(0.32-1.20)	0.159
	Moderate	11	41	0.2(0.12-0.49)	0.3(0.10-0.70)	0.001**
	Severe	01	10	0.1(0.01- 0.70)	0.03(0.01-0.63)	0.024*
	One comorbidity	38	45	0.7(0.21-2.50)	0.5(0.11-2.19)	0.356
	≥ Two comorbidities	4	7	1	1	

Discussion

5. Do the findings described by the author correlate with the results? Are the findings relevant?

The discussion section requires revision based on the recommendation given above in the inferential statistics

Conclusion

6. Do the conclusions correlate to the results found?

Yes, but it may be different when the inferential table is corrected

7. If the author has provided figures and tables are the figures and tables clear and legible? Are the figures free from unnecessary modification?

Tables are clear but they have quality problem, so, tables need quality improvement

8. Does the paper raise any concerns?

No Competing of interest

9. Do any of the authors' competing interests raise concerns about the validity of the study i.e. have the authors ?

Authors declared no competing of interest

Good luck to the authors!