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Reviewer's report:

The recommendations provided are all classified as discretionary revisions.

This article addresses the potential effects of integrated services on the health and social care needs of older community-living adults. Overall, the manuscript and particularly the findings and discussion are well presented with a clearly articulated purpose and evidence of methodological rigor employed in data collection and analysis. The research findings contribute to existing knowledge about the structure and organization of elder care service delivery networks and merit consideration in the development of health and social care policy. Comments provided are primarily editorial in nature.

To enhance clarity of presentation:
1. Consider ‘suggests’ versus ‘suggested’ in the 4th line of the ‘results’ section in the abstract.
2. Include the question (as noted in title of article and first section of discussion) in the background and/or methods section of the abstract. The research purpose/goal is well defined in the first sentence under the ‘Methods’ section.
3. Include a definition of ‘unmet needs’ (noted in measurement section), ‘activities of daily living’ and ‘instrumental activities of daily living’ (noted in Table 3) in the background section of the manuscript. Also consider inclusion of the salient features of the PRISMA Model in the background section.
4. Reword lines 5 and 6 in 3rd paragraph under background: Does care fragmentation result from a wide range of services and numerous care providers and partners – or could it be that the fragmentation results from how these services and partners are organized?
5. Consider review and reference of the following article, (and particularly reference to un-met needs among the elderly living in the community), in the discussion section of the manuscript:
6. In the 4th paragraph in methods section: instead of critiquing each study noted in this section, retain the descriptive preci and then present a synthesized critique of what is known and not known from the study findings presented in this
paragraph (for example, design issues, exposure time of intervention, health care provider participation (also, might any other health care providers in addition to physicians not have participated in the reported studies). A summary paragraph in this section would clearly identify the substantive issues underpinning the need for further study in the topic area.

7. Consider reporting the p value of all statistics reported in the narrative sections of the manuscript.

8. In the second paragraph in discussion section, 3rd last line, should ‘A’ be added at the beginning of the sentence?

9. Third last paragraph prior to conclusion – 4th line from the beginning of the paragraph add ‘un-met needs’ after ‘Our relatively high rates.....’

10. Consider discussion/recommendations for further research regarding how a case management/individualized service plan approach might enter into ‘factors’ that account for the differences in the level of unmet needs between experimental and control areas of the study.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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