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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and useful paper that is appropriate for the Journal.

Major compulsory revisions

The authors state that the aim of the reported study is to “ascertain and compare the construct validity of the EQ-5D with the ICECAP-O using valid and reliable measures of physiological falls risk, general balance and mobility, and cognitive status among older adults with mobility impairments.” This is a relevant and impairment goal because health related quality of life measures have generally not been developed and validated in older people with disabilities. The authors could briefly explain how cognitive status contributes to the construct validity of the two measures.

A little more information about the study participants should be provided. This should include the percentage who have had a fall, and a fall with injury, in the last 12 months, their mean (SD) gait velocity at baseline, and the percentage who had IADL and ADL impairment at baseline. This will allow readers to judge the extent to which participants had mobility disability.

The authors have not included participants with significant cognitive impairment. This should be listed as a limitation to the study.

Minor essential revisions:

1. Page 8 – The authors state “A score of less than 26/30 indicates mild cognitive impairment”. This is not a generally accepted fact. Either the authors should justify it with a reference or omit it.

2. Page 11 – The authors state that the “mean SPPB score was 7.5 (3.7) indicating what poor balance and mobility and subsequent risk for disability”. The meaning of this sentence should be clarified.

3. References 13 and 19 are the same paper.

4. In Table 1 the authors state “Short Performance Physical Battery (seconds) –total”. Should the word “seconds” be omitted?

5. Tables 2 and 3 should have titles that more clearly describe the content of each table.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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