Reviewer's report

Title: Frail elderly patients' experiences of information on medication. A qualitative study.

Version: 1 Date: 13 June 2012

Reviewer: Ekere Essien

Reviewer's report:
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Title: Frail elderly patients' experiences of information on medication: A qualitative study.

This study employed a qualitative methodology to derive information about the experiences of frail elderly patients' receiving information about their medications and their views on how the information should best be given. 12 personal interviews were conducted, 23 – 55 minutes in duration. The researchers recorded verbatim dialogue about the elderly participants’ experiences in receiving medical information and its impact on adherence. The researchers then discussed the patterns of the responses and suggested finding implications on the provision of medical information to elderly patients.

The manuscript is very well written. The authors have provided a clear and compelling justification for this work and how it will contribute to the advancement of knowledge in this field. They have also provided a detailed description of the qualitative analysis procedures in the methods section of the manuscript, which is appropriate for the readership given that few researchers understand qualitative research methods. The discussion is supported by the study findings, and the implications of the study are well articulated by the authors.

In order to further strengthen this manuscript, there are minor issues that need to be addressed:

1. Indicate the study year in the abstract.
2. In the procedures sections, describe the experience of the interviewer in conducting qualitative research interviews.
3. Clearly identify whether the tapes were transcribed by a professional transcriptionist. If not, indicate whether members of the investigative team reviewed the transcripts for accuracy.
4. Were the themes described in the manuscript derived from one, some, or all interviewees?
5. Edit the manuscript thoroughly for grammatical and typographical errors e.g.,
   - Page 6 line 10 should read “… a GP who was not involved in the medical care of the participants”.
   - Page 11 line 5 should read “…as exemplified here”.


- Page 18, line 20, It is not clear what the authors mean by “…for a positive effect is to be achieved”.

6. The authors should provide the readers with a copy of the semi-structured interview guide.

7. For the benefit of readers, the authors should explain the meaning of vocational education and compulsory education in Table 1.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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