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Reviewer's report:

The topic of this paper seems to be of interest: describing a methodology for reviews in the area of frailty in old age.

I have one major concern with this generally well-written paper: the specific research question that the authors want to address is not fully clear. What is exactly the question that the researchers want to answer? Interpretation of outcomes is further hampered that the Results and Discussion paragraph are mixed. As a result it is not clear for future readers what can be considered Results/outcomes ('facts') and Discussion/interpretation. I would recommend to make a split up here and answer some more specific research questions in Results and to discuss these in a following paragraph.

Minor comments:
- page 4: 'qualitative review': should this not be part of Methods?
- page 8: why were only papers included until 2005?
- page 8: second paragraph 'Before sending ...': please explain more in detail which abstracts were sent to which Question Leaders.
- page 9: line 3 'We had ...': how was this conducted?
- page 9: lines 6-7: 'The tools ised in the CIFA reviews were design to examine all of these': what is meant here? Not fully clear for future readers.
- page 10, top: is there a suggestion how 'methodological quality' should be weighted?
- page 11: Results and Discussion: as suggested before I would split up both sections and adopt a more structured way of presenting all outcomes
- what could be considered as limitations of this study?
- Conclusion: would it be possible to mention some more specific implications that could be used in the area of frailty research?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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