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Review BMC Nursing: Elise R Posma, Julia CM van Weert, Jesse Jansen and Jozien M Bensing: Educating older cancer patients about their treatment: An evaluation through the eyes of patients and professionals

Overall comment:
This article is investigating the needs of older cancer patients related their needs of information and support undergoing chemotherapy using qualitative methods. It is part of a larger prospective study, and contributes with detailed information about how patients, relatives and professionals experience and wish the education situation to be. The title could also include the relative perspective.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes: Three questions are posed.
However, please consider another word than naming the patients older experienced cancer patients.
The conceptual model appears in the manuscript a bit unexpected, could be introduced earlier.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes.
I have some minor comments:
Design: The word prospective should be mentioned in the introduction (p 4).
Setting: What does it mean that (oncology) nurses is written this way? Are they all oncology nurses or are they sometimes nurses with experience with cancer patients? Please explicate.
Subjects: Please rephrase the sentence: socio-demographic data, .... were also collected.
Data analysis: Reference 17 does not seem relevant as a methodological reference. Please consider other abbreviations. It was a bit difficult to keep track on all of them reading the result section: The patients could be abbreviated Pf (focus group) and Pi (interview, the relatives Rf (focus group).

3. Are the data sound?
Yes: The result section gives a clear picture of the results, first summing up the finding under the different headings, and then presenting expressions from the interview. The table is also useful.

I would consider leaving out the specific patient/relative expert number, as these expressions should be an example of the general finding and it does not matter for the reader which person said what. This could be stated in the methods section.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.
   I would also consider leaving out the text between [...ERP]. It disturbs the reading of the expression and is most often not necessary in order to understand.
   On p 17, “combine different methods of offering information”; was this not discussed during the focus groups interviews with the patients?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes: A good and interesting discussion.
   Some minor comments: p19; fewer cancer-related losses should be explained a bit more.
   P21: According to both focus groups: professionals or patients?
   The references 30 and 31 are physician studies, not nurses.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

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

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

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   Through my non-native English eyes yes, but others should evaluate this.

   **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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