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Reviewer's report:

General

This is an interesting report. At this moment, however, I am not able to assess the validity of this paper because important information is missing in this manuscript. I would discuss this later in "Major Compulsory Revisions". The high rate (37% in total; Fig 1) of those who discontinued the training is another concern.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1) Characteristics of the Study Participants
   The authors should describe physical and cognitive functioning of the study participants, e.g., % disabled in ADLs, % able to walk independently, % dementia, scores of Mini Mental State Examination (if measured), and so forth.
   This information is very important for us to assess the degree of external validity of the present findings.
   If demented cases were included into the participants, I am uncertain of the accuracy of their response to GDS or VPS. If demented cases were not included, I would like to know the reason why the authors used DQOL rather than other widely accepted tests such as SF-36.

2) Did exercise training itself improve physical function?
   I would like to know whether the exercise training in this study improved physical functioning of the participants or not. If this training had no effect in physical function, why could we expect any improvement in well-being of the participants? The authors should describe this information.

3) How did you calculate the drop-out rates (p.9)?
   The authors described the drop-out rate was 30% in strength training, 27% in functional training, and so on. If you define "drop out" as not attending the post-intervention measurement, the rates should be 28% and 20%, respectively. I would like to know how the authors calculate the drop-out rates.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
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