**Response to comments on proposal**

Date: 05/03/2025

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Question** | **Answer** |
| Prof. Wang Liang Yi | Need to check the numbers in table 3 and 4 because they do not match with each other (in follow-up columns). | The idea in the follow-up columns was stratification by **baseline** status, which means those who had, for example, poor adherence initially might improve their adherence in the future. |
| Prof. Susan Hu | Poor quality of data  Results are not reliable  Should consider using cross-sectional design and change the topic. | The project was originally repeated cross-sectional design. Each year, the city government decided different locations for data collection. Therefore the number of participants overlapping (or follow-up) were quite limited. However, we believe the choice of recruitment was by chance (random), which had little to do with subject-related reasons. |
| Prof. Li Chung Yi | Use the total sample analysis as your main results and the complete case as sensitivity analysis.  Consider other methods for sensitivity analysis such as best-worst case scenario, multiple imputation with a different design (that is using baseline X to predict the change of Y).  Discuss how the imbalance in terms of characteristics between the two groups would affect the direction or magnitude of your results.  Table 3 and 4 are confusing, need to clarify or redesign the table. |  |
| Prof. Yu Tsung | Results in the main and complete case analyses are actually the same. It’s just that the main analysis had larger sample size, therefore increase the power of the GEE test. |  |
|  |  |  |
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