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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract

- In order to improve the understandability of the study, the first sentence must refer to the primary care services reform ongoing in Brazil

The aim of the study improved with the new wording, nevertheless it remains not clear enough:

- Study population must be better clarified in the aim, (elderly population who received care….)

- You compare the primary care orientation of the services “received” by these elderly patients (not “provided”). You interview patients, you do not evaluate directly the services provided

- The statement of the objective b) is also confusing to me. You want to know if the PHC orientation of the services perceived by the elderly population cared in Brazilian primary health care is associated to the organisation of the services (FHS vs BHU), or to the sort of patient’s chronic diseases.

Method: The number of interviewed patients must be in results. In methods you must clarify the inclusion criteria. You must mention where was performed the survey (at the point of delivering care: health centre or home)

Results: start with the number of patients interviewed and the response rate. Results must be in figures. Second sentence is difficult to understand because is everything in negative (Chronic problems were not independently associated with lower PHC score, except hypertension and cardiovascular disease)

Background.

Same problems in clarifying the objective are present at the end of the background section

Methods

Consent was only asked to the health centre staff? Not to the patients interviewed?
Discussion:

The sentence “Such association between model of care and PHC score was independent of socioeconomic status or major health problems” must be deleted, because you can’t make this statement with a bivariate analysis. The populations who receive the different model of care have differences in the education, social level and health. How do you prove these variables do not influence the results?

The sentence “These results suggest that the model of care in PHC was associated with quality of life” must be modified. It is not proved. You mention the PHC high score was associated to lower physical component. I understand the multivariate analysis neutralise the effect of the other health and social variables. Same is true for the paragraph beginning with “Quality of life for the elderly population was shown to be associated with the PHC score....” You can’t establish a causal relationship between PHC orientation and quality of life. You go too far in your conclusions. In your descriptive study you can only state that people with better mental health and lower physical health perceive the care their receive as more PHC orientated.

Conclusions in the text and in the abstract must be also changed accordingly

Provide reference for the sentence “In a multivariate analysis the low PHC score was explained by work status as well as by the type of health care model”
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