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Reviewer’s report:

The authors made substantial efforts to improve their manuscript. I am satisfied with the most of their answers/explanations. Still I disagree with some of them. For example, the number of frail people screened using their approach is too high and defy my common sense despite their explanations despite the reference (Pei-Little et al., 2009) is provided with even higher prevalence numbers.

I understand that the prevalence may depend on the definition but if you want your definition was in use by the broader audience it is important to get the numbers –carefully validated- their range (out of range) could testify against (in favor) of any definition. For example, if according to a certain definition, 90% of community dwelling people in a s developed country are frail – it means that something is basically wrong with such definition and with the instrument based on that definition.
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