Reviewer’s report

Title: Educating older cancer patients about their treatment: An evaluation through the eyes of patients and professionals

Version: 1 Date: 29 October 2008

Reviewer: A M Pietila

Reviewer’s report:

Manuscript: Educating older cancer patients about their treatment: An evaluation through the eyes of patients and professionals

This is a clearly constructed article that sets out its purpose, background, methodology, findings and discussion in context of patient education among older cancer patients. The contents of the article are interesting. As a general impression: the article is of good quality. However, there are details which need be reviewed. The ethical and validity issues raised as part of the study are very shortly described.

Abstract is very logical and clear.

Background: it informs the debate around patient education for older cancer patients.

The research questions are quite well defined at the end of background information.

Methods are appropriate and the participants are described. However I would encourage the authors to continue to develop the description about qualitative analysis process. What are the phases of the analysis process? One example of the qualitative data management and organization would be very useful.

Results: Are the results described according research questions? There are quite lot quotes which illustrate the findings. It is however important to evaluate are all the quotes appropriate.

Discussion and conclusions are quite well balanced and adequately supported by the data. The limitations of the work are stated.

Figure 1 Conceptual model ...must be better described

It is important that authors could more emphasize the validity issues in this qualitative study and ethical viewpoints also.

Quality of written English is quite good

I would like to reinforce some comments:
1. The methodology, especially data analysis must be better described.
2. Ethical considerations (eg. consent form, ethics committee) must be discussed and described.
3. Results: logical presentation according research questions
4. Figure 1: it is important to describe this conceptual model more clearly.

Quality of written English: Acceptable