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Reviewer's report:

Line 106 Conducting 20 interviews for enough "information power" requires an explanation. I understand that the COREQ list was presented to detail the qualitative process, but how is that specific number satisfy a scientific study? How has data saturation been achieved?

Line 129 Inconsistent methodology raises a question about the quality of the data. In the COREQ list, it suggested that the question topics derived from a pilot study of 25 participants. Is the study submitted the same study? Please make that clear.

Line 180 and 327 Beside the "need for a holistic view" and "unexpected help" the themes are mainly related to the problems of the CGA program. The problems delineated are interesting but since they exceed the good so the findings "dilute" the participants' satisfaction and raises questions whether CGA is any good. Elaborating the explanation and the discussion on the latter (unexpected help) can more helpful to view CGA as a preventive strategy design since that is the direction we are going with the health care in aging societies.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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