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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall, I think these authors are trying to put too much information into a single paper. The work is sound, the analysis is appropriate, and the findings are meaningful, but it's just a lot of information to try to meld together into a single paper.

I would recommend this be presented in two separate papers - the focus group findings / qualitative results could be a single paper. This could include the community program activities and delivery considerations. The second paper could address the quantitative analysis and findings. I understand they've used a mixed methods approach, and they believe there's an important connection between their qualitative and quantitative findings, but the paper just includes too much information. I'm afraid the meaning gets lost... Perhaps compounding the issue is the multitude of abbreviations used throughout the paper. It's a lot to keep up with for a reader who is not familiar with the program or domains.

Finally, I see that older adults were considered age 50 and older. In the US, research describing "older" adults typically includes subjects 65 and older; sometimes 60 and older. So that stands out to me as a potential flaw since the paper is focused on successful aging - most consider 50 to be middle-aged. Are there cultural considerations that make using 50+ more appropriate? If so, those should be clarified. (I don't know what "Third Age" means, but 50 does not sound like it...)

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

See comments above. I believe there are issues with the objective and design of the paper in its current format - biting off more than they can chew by presenting in a single paper.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

In the US we would say "lessons learned," so depending on the audience I think the paper will need minor grammatical edits along those lines throughout.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
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.

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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