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Reviewer's report:

BMC Oral HealthHow do we incorporate patient views into the design of health-care services for older people.OHEA-D-16-00504Background: peri-implantitis (instead of mucositis?) poor references with only examples of the Netherlands and UKBirch … - reference? The introduction should concentrate more on patient centred care. Background and introduction should be separated and for the reader's comfort it is better to put the aim of the study at the end of the introduction. There is some contradiction between the aim of the study and the end of the actual introduction. The aim is to explore some approaches in the design of health care services for older people and the end of the introduction already provides us with an answer on this research question. Methods/design This is the most important part of the article but cannot be considered as a 'method' or 'design'. This looks like a commentary on approaches already undertaken in the Netherlands, Ireland and the UK. The reference numbers in the text do not always correspond with the numbers in the reference list. Conclusion: this is not a conventional article but rather an interesting report with a useful commentary on some approaches in the design of health care services for older people already undertaken and described in The Netherlands, Ireland and the UK. It should be useful for the reader to change the title in this way. How do we incorporate patient views into the design of health-care services for older people - Commentary on some experiences already undertaken in Europe.

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.

Unable to assess

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:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests'

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal