Reviewer’s report

Title: The quality of life of patients with genital warts: a qualitative study

Version: 1 Date: 21 January 2010

Reviewer: Leana Uys

Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes, the research is focused and the objectives are clear.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? What was done is appropriate, but I am not convinced that the discourse approach was actually followed. A discourse analysis is a very detailed sentence by sentence analysis, and I found no evidence of an analysis of actual terms used or their emotional or cultural meanings. In the current study the approach has more in common with a descriptive qualitative study. Although NVivo allows for the type of analysis described by the authors as step three (looking for the frequency of connections between topics or themes) this aspect of the analysis does not become visible in the results as they are reported. So, there is nothing wrong with the methodology, but I would not think that calling it a discourse analysis is a good reflection of what was done.

I would recommend that the authors definitely re-consider the classification of their study and if they insist that it is a discourse analysis, I think they need to put more detail in to support this assertion.

3. Are the data sound? Yes, the themes are well supported by the qualitative data, and are also easily distinguished from each other.

Since I was asked to comment on the methodology, I will not go into the rest of the headings.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

9. Is the writing acceptable?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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