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Reviewer's report:

The research theme is important, and it is of value that focus groups were conducted in three different districts. However, I think minor revisions are necessary before publication. Please check the following things.

Data collection

1. The focus group discussions were held in the home language of participants (English, isiXhosa or Afrikaans). Which language was used for analysis? If one language (e.g. English) was used, were transcripts by isiXhosa or Afrikaans translated into English? How did the authors ensure the credibility of translation?

2. I think references for the methodology of focus groups should be added.

Data analysis

3. Interfaces and functions are different among NVivo versions. Please specify the version of NVivo which the authors used.

4. I think references for the methodology of analysis should be added, too.

5. I think it is critical to eliminate prejudices of researchers for qualitative analysis. If any methodology was used for prevention of confirmation bias, please write it.

Limitations of approach
6. I think it is better to insert this section into discussion.

Results

7. I recommend tables which show demographic variables of each focus group (e.g. sex, age, languages, duration of time, number of participants) should be included in Methods or Results section.
8. Explanation of excerpts should be written for readers who are not familiar with qualitative researches. e.g. Excerpts are written in an italic type and FG or FG1 means the identification number of each participant.

9. How about explaining an outline of results in the first paragraph of results section (before Health service use). It may be helpful for readers to grasp the comprehensive image of results.

10. I recommend the authors explain "medical aid" for the readers. Those who live in South Africa will understand the meaning, but others might not comprehend it.

11. I think the following sentences be put in Discussion, not in Results. For me, the sentences are not results which emerged from only this analysis.
   From "In their study of (p14)" to "by the doctor" (the bottom of p14).

12. I felt senior's clubs had very important role in management of community care. How about making another category for explaining the role of senior's clubs. In this manuscript, it is written in the paragraphs of "perceptions of treatment by healthcare workers", but it is not suitable to explain the role of senior's clubs.

13. In addition, the paragraphs of "perceptions of treatment by healthcare workers" are too long and contains various themes. How about splitting them into some categories?

Discussion

14. It is good to write limitations and future researches in the Discussion section.

15. I think difference of health literacy among each population may influence on the results. How about discussing it?

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.

Unable to assess

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

No
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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