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Reviewer’s report:

1. Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
   a. The results are given in the table and same has been described in the text. The text may say that table XX describes -----.
   b. The results are supported by data however major revision are required for making them succinct and readable
   c. The tables should be reformatted into smaller versions; some may be transformed to graphs as these are simple frequency tables.
   d. Discussion should
      i. compare the results with previous studies (done well) in a succinct manner. Presently it is too detailed and reads like a thesis
      ii. delete paragraphs that repeat information already given in introduction (para 1 in discussion, first few lines in the second para)
      iii. lead to conclusions, at this time it is a mish mash of information on literature and the results are not organized for comparison in a logical fashion. My suggestion is to use 1-2 para for one table compare your results with other studies and that will make up for one conclusion or it should lead into the next result.

2. Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
   a. Presently it reads like position paper and has to be transformed into a succinct research paper (preferably a short report). The study does not have any new information as it is only verifying claims from other community-based studies using data from a tertiary high-end hospital.
   b. The presence of bias in the study should be recognized.
   c. The results of this study cannot be applied to the entire population.

   The question posed by the authors are very well defined
   a. There are many issues addressed in this paper and they need to be either addressed up front or the paper can (should) focus on only one aspect of geriatrics which is patient’s expectations.
b. The methods are well defined. Heavily biased results are expected as this is a high-end hospital where in the ambulatory clinics mostly educated people form high income bracket seek care.

Acknowledging work from other authors on which they are building, both published and unpublished?

i. Yes and no. They have mentioned the studies done previously however not acknowledged any major study, it seems that they are asking the same questions addressed in some previous community-based studies.
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