
Review of Wikipedia Articles

The review is meant to facilitate further improvement of Wikipedia articles. Suggestions about the quality of a Wikipedia articles can be found at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Featured_article_criteria.

Please send your review in pdf and .doc format to Marta Pucciarelli: marta.pucciarelli@supsi.ch and Florence Devouard: florence.devouard@supsi.ch

Name of the reviewer	Paul Krabbe
Affiliation	University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen
Title of the article	Health
I hereby declare I'm submitting this text under a Creative Commons attribution share alike license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/	

1. Quality of the Summary

Is the summary of the article a complete, thorough, and concise introduction to the topic? How do you think the summary could be improved? Which meaningful data are missing? Is there something that you find too much detailed for a general overview of the topic?

Good.

2. Structure and style of the article

Is the article properly presenting the topic for a general public? Does the article provide a complete and easy-to-navigate structure? Which paragraph would you add, unify or split into different parts? Please provide a list of suggestions. Is the article well written and understandable at a high school level?

I have some concerns about the structure. After a nice and informative introduction one of the subsequent heading is "Mental health". Why is that part of health so exclusively discussed? Why not physical health?

Also, the content about "Maintaining health" seems a bit out of order. This is certainly an important element, but if this is discussed in such detail I would also expect discussions, apart from Determinants, about more general elements in relationship to health.

A heading such as "Potential issues" is too vague.

3. Content

Is the article comprehensive of major facts related to the topic? Is the article adequately placing the subject in context? What does it miss? Please provide a list of topics you think should be included in the article

Wikipedia Primary School: Providing on Wikipedia the information necessary to complete the cycle of primary education in the languages used by the different education systems. Document updated 10 October 2015.

(suggestions must be related to bibliography). Do you find that some arguments are not meaningful or representative of the topic for a general public. What should be deleted? Please explain why.

What I missed is a general concept or model about health that is discussed in the Introduction. For example, the health model of Wilson and Cleary (Wilson, I.B., Cleary, P.D., 1995. Linking clinical variables with health-related quality of life: a conceptual model of patient outcomes. JAMA; 273(1): 59-65) may be used as such a tool to direct the discussion.

You may also present some material about "the importance of health". For example Maslow need hierarchy and other theorist and evidence from empirical studies.

I also missed a presentation about different health concepts and different health outcomes (physical functioning, health status, health-related quality of life, quality of life, capabilities, etc.).

Under determinants it is stated that "Gender" may influence whether people are healthy or unhealthy. I question whether this background characteristic is really in itself affecting health. Probably, 'gender' is observed in some studies as a factor, but probably this is not due to the gender itself, but due to cultural factors.

4. International and local dimension

Is the article neutral (it presents general and acknowledged views fairly and without bias)? Is the article representative of the international dimension and consolidated research about the topic? If applicable, does the article feature examples from all over the world (no localisms)? Please draft a list of what is missing with related references.

No comments

5. References (essential to allow the articles to be improved)

Is the list of publications comprehensive and updated? Does it list the fundamental monographs and papers? Please provide primary/generic and secondary/original resources which need to be included and suggest the list of publications which should be removed.

Ref. 7 seems incorrect. It is "... A new approach to health (not pain)".