Reviewer's report

Title: "Physical function and self-rated health status as predictors of mortality – results from longitudinal analysis in the iLSIRENTE study"

General: This is a well-written manuscript and logically organized that addresses an important topic area in the very old population.

Abstract: Concise and specific.

Introduction: The literature used is pertinent to the study and the purpose of the study and the hypothesis were clearly stated.

Methods: The study design was appropriate to achieve the objective. Study population was well described. However, I have few concerns:

1) A description of the hand grip strength maneuver is needed.
2) Which were the responses options for the Basic Activities of Daily Living and the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living? Were the participants asked if they could do the activity, or if they could do the activity with help, or they could not do the activity at all? and how each question was coded.
3) Is not clear through the manuscript if physical function is the same as physical performance. Are physical function measure the ones that includes physical performance measure (4-meter walking speed, balance, and chair stand tests) and hand grip muscle strength?
4) The authors found that the chair stand test was the best predictor of mortality when the physical performance measure was analyzed individually. Did the authors run the analysis using the actual quartiles of the chair stand test excluding those who were unable to complete the test, and see if those who were able to complete the test but were in the lowest performance still are at high risk for mortality?
5) The three tasks of physical performance (4-meter walking speed, balance, and chair stand tests) were assigned scores ranging from 1-4 for those who were able to complete the task. However, these measures were used as a continuous variable for the mortality analysis. Did the author perform additional analysis using them as a categorical variable (for example, unable, lowest to the highest category)?

Results: Clearly presented.
Tables and figures: Well presented.

Discussion: The discussion supports their hypothesis. Previous pertinent literature was compared with author’s findings. Study limitations and implications were identified. Conclusions are clearly stated.

References: Three were 41, all appropriate.

**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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