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Review

Family-centered depression treatment for older men in primary care: a qualitative study of stakeholder perspectives

This article cover an interesting topic, relevant for general practice.

Abstract

In the abstract, you write: "surprisingly little is known about how to most effectively encourage and include family members in depression treatment». And after that: "The objective of this study was to describe challenges in engaging family members in older men's depression treatment and their implications for depression treatment and interventions in primary care."

In the background part you describe you conducted interviews "to elicit the perspectives of key stakeholders on the acceptability and feasibility of involving family members in older men's depression care in primary care settings".

These descriptions of the objective of the study is not fully corresponding, and should be made clearer. What is the objective of the study? To address the challenges of engaging family support?

Or to explore important factors to succeed engaging family support in treatment of depressed old men? I think your objective must be made more clear.

Background

This section is well described.
Methods

Why have you chosen a qualitative approach?

Participant selection: The recruitment process is carefully described. You have to explain PHQ-9 score (at least with a reference). For the recruitment of staff, you have chosen a purposive sample, I miss an explanation why all these different professions are included. What was the thoughts about how each group could add to the study?

Analysis: The method you chose for analysis must be better explained. NVIVO 10 is a tool helping organizing text, but the method or approach used for analysis should be explained in much more detail, so we can see what kind of steps you used, and see where your results come from. It may be better using one method reference.

Results

These must be corresponding with the aim of the study. What kind of family involvement are you talking about? Maybe you could give an example or explain what you mean by that. If this is a study involving development and implementation of a family intervention model, maybe this model should be explained shortly?

The themes are well described, representing experiences and thoughts about how and when family members could be involved in care, and how to overcome potential challenges.

Discussion

I find this part well written. Again be sure the results presented are consistent with the aim of the study. In the first part of the discussion you write about how your results add to understanding of challenges and how these might be addressed in the development and implementation of a family-centered treatment model for depression. This is an expansion of the objective of the study.

Table 3 is god visualizing the results of the study.

Conclusion

I miss a clear statement of what this study add to the research field.
Table 1

To use "Characteristics of included or interviewed depressed older me…." in the heading would make it more clear.

How do you know their general health? Self-report?

Here is really much information. Is it all relevant, for instance income?

Table 3

For the table to stand alone, you should add "….core challenges involving family in depression care for older men, and possible…" or something similar.

You must explain HIPAA-guidelines, or give a reference.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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