

Peer Review

Review of: "Sociodemographic, Clinical, and Psychological Barriers to Medication Compliance: The Case of Patients with Musculoskeletal Disorders in Greece"

Alban Ylli¹

1. University of Medicine Tirana, Tirana, Albania

The paper may be of interest to a broad spectrum of professionals from medical practice, public health, or academia. Nonetheless, there are some essential flaws that should be addressed by the authors before publication.

In the introduction section, the authors present various definitions for compliance and different nuances the problem may take in health practice, but don't make fully clear which one they are using for this paper. It may be confusing for the reader. Also, in some cases, the sentences don't follow a logical sequence, i.e., the first sentence in the second paragraph or the second half of the fifth paragraph.

Are patients identified in hospital settings, primary health care settings, or elsewhere?

The authors state that it is a convenience sample, but how exactly are participants enrolled? From a registry? Visiting the hospital on certain days? In a patient's association? How were they interviewed? Face to face or by phone?

Why mention as an inclusion criterion 'being over 18 years old' when it is a convenient sample of elderly patients?

Why are both physical and mental fatigue qualified as psychological?

What are the cut-offs for the SEAMS scale? Is it analyzed just as a continuous variable? For the FAS, this is clarified in the methods section but not for the SEAMS? How are participants categorized in terms of compliance, which is the key independent variable in the study? In the results section, data

are shown in several tables for the distribution of all dependent variables' categories but not for the SEAMS. It can be confusing for the reader.

What is 'W'? It is shown throughout the paper (including in the abstract) as the main statistical result of interest but is never explained. What analysis is applied to explore any statistical association?

The results based on pairwise comparison for each dependent variable category may be confusing or even misleading. It may be better to apply a simple ANOVA or another technique of the authors' preference.

Among the limitations of the study, the authors should underline that they are not controlling for confounders and that the associations presented should be considered with caution. It could have been possible to control for multiple associations by applying a multivariate technique such as a regression.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.