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Reviewer's report:

General

The addition of information about topics included in the workshops is helpful in clarifying program content. The addition of quotes from participants and specific observations of researchers provides the data that are essential in illustrating how conclusions were drawn.

---

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

---

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract and pg 8: The term "measure" is used to describe how empowerment was assessed. This should be changed to "assess", because specific measures were not used in the study.

The use of the term "enforcement", related to self-care and mutual-help, persists in the manuscript (e.g., pg. 3, pg. 4). This seems inconsistent with the assumptions/key elements (pg. 2-3) of the Gerontological Care Model. The term should be changed to something like "supported".

The assertion about a commonly held myth that knowledge acquisition is difficult after age 50 is puzzling and requires a source, and an explanation, i.e., is this a myth within a particular group of people? This "myth" would not be prevalent (or common) in many other locations.

Data analysis, pg 9: Is this referring only to attendance data, or were other data analyzed, too?

pg 10, paragraph 2: Drop-out causes for the 2nd workshop should be in a separate paragraph, and the discussion should address hypotheses about the differences between the 2 workshops.

Findings section: should add headings for each aspect of empowerment that was assessed (per pg 4 statement). Personal dimension is identified, but headings for the other aspects are missing.
In the Discussion (pg 17), the authors note that women had a "more emphatic attitude change...". This needs clarification, i.e., does this mean that compared to the male participants, women showed a greater increase in empathy (is this a spelling error), or where the women more passionate about expressing their changes? In any event, the data for this claim need to be presented in the findings, to establish a context for reference in the Discussion.

The stated purpose for the study (pg 4) was to analyze factors contributing to empowerment of older adults. The conclusion (pg 18) need to clearly address this original purpose statement.

pg 4 (and Table 4): 3rd bullet, should be "mainly", not "meanly"; 4th bullet, meaning isn't clear

pg 7: clarify "they"; "In the second phase, they selected...."

pg 7: omit "On the other hand" phrase and start sentence with "The gerontological.."

pg 7: clarify "...each promoter had to conduct a t workshop..."

pg 12: omite "On the other hand" phrase and start sentence with "With regard to ...

Table 1: suggested title revision "Workshop community gerontology topics"

Table 4: analysis cell of 4th indicator should clarify that the tendencies were identified in this sample - without implying generalizability to all older adults.

Overall, would suggest elimination of most instances of terminology like "it is important to note/emphasize", "it was found that", "it became evident", "in this regard/sense", "that is to say". These phrases are unnecessary and detract from the content of the sentence.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

---

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**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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