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Reviewer's report:

Overall the article was very interesting and the performed research was clearly explained in detail.

- Minor essential revisions
  Incorporate page numbers.

English writing needs corrections. Sometimes the word order and the use of transitions is incorrect.

This may lead to misconceptions and or misunderstandings.

For example: “Individuals over the age of 65 in Western and Central Europe were 79 million in 2005.” should be: “In 2005 there were 79 million individuals over the age of 65 in Western and Central Europe.” (page 6)

I did not exactly understand what was meant by “In addition, other services, such as meal preparation, might be available to all upon request abroad, yet only in certain programs and individuals in Greece, if the decision-makers find it necessary.” (page 6)

Remove subsequently in “that were not included subsequently in the main study” (page 7)

Use either ‘since’ or ‘however’ in “Since however that factor…” (page 15)

Suggestion: change “Higher levels of satisfaction were associated with the skills and attitudes of the staff and the suitability of services whereas lower with the social ….” into “Higher levels of satisfaction were associated with the skills and attitudes of the staff and the suitability of services. Whereas lower levels were associated with the social ….” (page 21)

It is not explained how and from which database the subjects were extracted. How many subjects were exactly retrieved and invited? There were some numbers given on page 9 and 14. You came up with a final sample of 201 subjects and a corresponding response rate of 68 percent while it is unclear how you determined your starting sample.

Page 14 and table 2. You show some demographic variables in table 2 and in the text on page 14, as I count correctly these demographic variables are retrieved from your final sample. If that is correct, explain it in the text and the table. But
more importantly, to determine the generalisability of this investigation the final sample should be compared (on some demographic variables, at least gender, age, educational level) with the starting sample as well as with the population of Greek elderly. Is it possible to add demographic variables of the starting sample. Can you show whether the final sample is representative for the Greek elderly population?

State in the text what the suggested literature value is. (page 17)

I do feel that the limitations of the study are not well described. The authors should reflect a little more on the inability to compare the constructed instrument with comparable instruments in a Greek setting or in an international setting.

I do miss a reflection on how well the results describe the truth for the Greek elderly population.

Table 5: it is not clear for me for which scales or items polyserial correlations were used. All questions were asked on a 5-point likert scale, so, if I understand correctly, there can’t be any items or scales with more than 15 categories?

The word instrument in the title and conclusions is very common, it can mean varying things. Can you change it into questionnaire, to make clear what kind of instrument you mean exactly?

- Discretionary revisions

An additional reflection on the limitations of measuring satisfaction compared with subject experiences would be very interesting

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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