Reviewer's report

Title: Involving the elderly in their own healthcare

Version: 1 Date: 1 November 2007

Reviewer: Anita Atwal

Reviewer's report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

These are all Major Compulsory Revisions

(1): Abstract: Need to be rewritten to improve its clarity. The findings are not presented clearly, or is it know whether the findings refer to the GPs or older adults

Need to ensure that you make it clear this study occurred in Slovenia

(2) Title: Does not reflect the content of the paper

(3) A clearer rationale is needed as to why this study was needed- the aims of the study does not fit the background material

(4) Method: More detail is needed about the sample and recruitment of older adults. And GPs Why 40 and 26? – This is a qualitative study so why did you aim to recruit a specific number? How many older adult refused- in my experience recruitment of older adults to research studies is often difficult

The aims of the interviews are not clear- what were the interview question questions? Did both older adults and GPs have the same questions?

More detail is needed about data analysis, how the data was transcribed and you arrived at the themes. More over the themes are not presented clearly

Findings: The heading used in the findings to not verify the themes that have been identified. If the GPs and older adult’s opinions are presented together then you need to think carefully how this data is to be presented. I would suggest that the authors need to think carefully about how their data was analysed.

Discussion: It is difficult to ascertain from this study what is new and how it supports the existing literature. More over what impact does this study have on practice?

Ethics: Need to be much clearer about what type of ethical permission was granted- did you not encouter any other ethical issues?
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Reject because scientifically unsound

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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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