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Reviewer’s report:

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

Background: The questions posed by the authors are: ‘What is the role of client councils’ However, we cannot understand what a “council” is, especially regarding the information of its role, organizer, numbers in Netherland, conformation of the members and basic characteristics etc. Without clear explanation of “council”, international readers cannot evaluate the value or meaning of the research questions (Background, third paragraph).

Methods: More detail explanation for the methods will be needed, Especially more for the Qualitative method: how the samples were chosen, Does “13 representatives of client councils of 11 nursing homes” mean some nursing homes have more than two representatives, or client councils?

Results: The results of the first part (qualitative analyses) are not described, and not mentioned how related to the later part.

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

The definition and explanation about “quality cycle” and relation to “client councils” should be described more in details.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

Abstract, third paragraph: “Right of consent” should be “Right to consent”.

Abstract, third paragraph: The percent for the perceived right to be consulted should be 31%-46% based on the table.

Methods, second paragraph: Typographic error. It should be SPSS and not SPPS.

Results, third paragraph: The authors could explain more the implications behind the statement of “results were scarcely use to make quality improvement theories”

Discussion, second paragraph: What is the base used by the authors to fix the limit of 50% when considering the exercise or not of rights.
Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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