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Dr. Jonathan D. Adachi
Professor, St. Joseph’s Hospital, McMaster University
Room 501, 25 Charlton Ave. E. Hamilton Ontario L8N 1Y2
Email address: jd.adachi@sympatico.ca

Dear Dr. Tuan Nguyen,

Re: MS: 1114343941120921 entitled ‘Frailty index of deficit accumulation and falls: data from the Global Longitudinal Study of Osteoporosis in Women (GLOW) Hamilton cohort’

Thank you for your email dated April 28, 2014 with the Associate Editor’s comments on our paper. We thank you again for the opportunity to submit a revised version of the above paper. The comments were very helpful. Please find attached the revised version of the manuscript. In this cover letter, we have provided a point-by-point response below to the concerns raised by the reviewer. All new changes have been highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. We hope we have adequately addressed all the comments, and that the paper is now in an acceptable form. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jonathan D. Adachi
Professor, St. Joseph’s Hospital, McMaster University
Associate Editor’s comments: Thank you for your response to the reviewers’ comments. I think the work is interesting and potentially relevant to public health. I consider that the conclusion (in the Abstract) is not clearly written. Could I suggest that instead of using the expression “FI was related”, the author could use the expression “FI was associated”. What was the area under the curve (AUC) of your predictive model? The association should be expressed as odds ratio (OR) per standard deviation of FI (rather than per 0.01). OR should be rounded to 2 decimal places.

Authors’ Response: Thanks very much for your comments and suggestions. The comments are very helpful. Please kindly find the response below.

In the Abstract, we revised the Conclusion section based on your suggestion (Page 2, Line 29) and added the area under the curve (AUC) to the Results section (Page 2, Line 17-18).

We chose to report all the statistics based on per 0.01 increment of the FI because:

(1) one paper by Rockwood et al [1] as the guideline of the construction of a FI suggested using per 0.01 change to report the results;

(2) several studies [1-3] reported their findings measured by an increase of 0.01 on the FI, and we wanted to compare our results with theirs.

However we truly appreciated your suggestion of reporting the findings with per standard deviation (SD) increase of the FI. Therefore we reported both findings using an increase of 0.01 and per 1-SD increment on the FI (Page 10, Line 187-190), and accordingly updated the statistics and results in the manuscript (Page 12, Line 238-240; Page 13, Line 269-270; Page 14, Line 278-279, Line 284-285) and in the Abstract (Page 2, Line 24-26).

According to your suggestion, we also changed the statistics to 2 decimal places through the manuscript (Page 2; Page 12-14; Page 29 (Table 3); Page 30 (Table 4)).
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