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Reviewer's report:

The authors responded to most of the comments, but the following points should be checked and may be improved.

a. P2 L12: The meaning of the next sentence is not clear. ‘Individuals were about the presence of chronic illnesses that had been diagnosed by a physician.’

   The sentence is revised as “Individuals were interviewed about the presence of chronic illnesses that had been diagnosed by a physician”.

b. P2 L19: The meaning of the next sentence is not clear. ‘Majority if older people…’ Does it mean ‘majority of…’?

   It is “majority of…” The sentence is revised accordingly.

c. P3 L6: The first statement in the conclusion is ‘unmet daily needs remain for older people.’ This conclusion seems to be drawn from the authors’ expectation before starting the research rather than based on the results. In the results section, opposite evidence seemed to be more emphasized, such as: the majority had no need of support for each of the specific ADL items; over three-fifths of those who needed help received enough support in all ADL dimensions. What should be the most important conclusions which are supported by the results of this study and meet the objectives of this study?

   The conclusion that “unmet daily needs remain for older people” is replaced by “Although majority of older people who needed help received enough support in daily care, the need of care is more demanded in disadvantaged groups”.

d. P5 L19 and other pages: The term ‘subject’ may be changed to ‘participant’ or ‘respondent.’

   The term is replaced accordingly.

e. P8 Table 2 and 3: In Table 2, nearly 90% of the elderly responded ‘no need’ for support. In Table 3, again nearly 90% of the elderly responded they had enough support. Does it make sense? Those who do not need support seem to receive
enough support. Is this interpretation correct? Or, they do not need ‘extra support’ because they have already received ‘enough support’?

Table 2 describes the need of support (or levels of dependency in ADLs) among all the older people while Table 3 summaries the level of receiving support from caregivers to only those who are in need of support. The terms of levels of receiving support in the Table 3 are revised accordingly.

f. P10 L6: In the response sheet, the authors mentioned that “the statement that over one third of those who need help do not receive enough support” is revised as….. However, the beginning sentence in the discussion still uses the similar expression.

The sentence is removed.

g. P10 L22: ‘Young-old ages’ and ‘middle-old ages’ are not defined in the methods.

The definitions are added in the sentence.

h. The discussion seems to be unnecessarily too long. Each paragraph should be discussed based on the unique findings of this research.

The discussion is shortened accordingly.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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