Reviewer's report

Title: Emerging organisational models of primary healthcare and unmet needs for care: insights from a population-based survey in Quebec province.

Version: 3 Date: 24 May 2012

Reviewer: Alison M Elliott

Reviewer's report:

This is the second review of a paper I have previously reviewed and requested amendments.

The authors have responded to most of my queries adequately. These changes and the additional changes requested by the other reviewer have improved the quality of the paper. In response to a few of the points raised the authors have provided an adequate answer in the covering letter but have not made any changes to the paper. I would suggest that for the following issues the authors should include some comment in the paper to clarify the issue for other readers, rather than just the reviewer.

Minor essential revisions
1) Point 1 in the letter: it would be helpful if the authors stated that the questions were derived from existing literature and that the questionnaire was found to have face and content validity.
2) Point 4 in the letter: the authors state that for this revised version of the manuscript the categories were revised and uncollapsed. Given this do we still need the statement in the last paragraph of the methods referring to categories being collapsed?
3) Point 5 in the letter: the addition of actual p-values is useful and allows us to look at the level of significance between groups. The authors say they discuss the issue around large sample sizes, multiple testing and more stringent significance levels in the Discussion. In fact though the reference to more stringent p-values in the Discussion is in relation to a small sample size and lack of power where more stringent p-values would be unnecessary. I would like to see the authors refer to the increased likelihood of type I errors in this study due to its large sample size.
4) The first sentence of the Discussion doesn't have an ending... finishing "which are".

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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