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Reviewer's report:

The authors have largely addressed my previous concerns. There are still a few more minor outstanding issues. These are all considered “minor essential revisions”.

Abstract

The sentence, “Risks of one-year mortality …” should also include a statement that the referent group was the robust/non frail group.

It would be preferable to report the number of deaths and hospitalizations in the abstract, but I’m not sure that would fit within the word limit.

The sentence, “Pre-frail residents defined by absolute cut-points….” should end with a statement such as “compared to those who were classified as non-frail”.

Analysis section of the methods: The sentence, “The risks of one-year mortality and hospitalization for those categorized frail or pre-frail …” should note that the referent group was non-frail individuals.

Table 4

It would be clearer to report add a line for the referent group for the frailty models. This would be for the “non-frail” individuals and would be listed as something like “1.00 (referent). This way, it is clear that frail/pre-frail/non-frail individuals were all considered in the same model.

Somewhere in the paper, it would be helpful to report the number of participants with each outcome – and how these numbers would pertain to the models that are shown in Table 4. It is likely that the models stratified by sex have relatively few participants in the “non-frail” group and few events within this non-frail group. It might be done as a footnote to table 4 or in the text.
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