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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for a well-written manuscript. You used measures of physiological falls risk, general balance and mobility, and cognitive status to evaluate the construct validity of two measures of quality of life (EuroQOL-5D & ICECAP-O). However, I have major concerns.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. To evaluate construct validity, you must ensure that the measure of interest captures all the elements of the construct but no others. Within your manuscript, you list the overarching elements of the two measures (EURO-QOL: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain, anxiety and depression; ICECAP-O: attachment, security, role, enjoyment, and control). Unfortunately, you only use measures of physiological falls risk, general balance and mobility, and cognitive status to evaluate construct validity. These are certainly not sufficient and not necessarily appropriate to evaluate the construct validity these quality of life measures. If you are to frame this manuscript as an evaluation of construct validity, you will have to expand the measures used to validate these QOL measures (possibly including self-perceived health, social support, ADLs, co-morbidities).

Minor Essential Revisions
1. You mention that a key strength of your study is that you compare the ICECAP- (a relatively new instrument) to an established instrument (EQ-5D). However, this was not done directly in the analyses. It also was not an objective of the study, as stated.
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