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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I. In the introduction, the author only described the previous study. Are there other existing scales or single assessment instrument have been used before and how do they work?
II. In the participants section in Methods, author stated “A random sample … together with all participants … were included in the study.” Later in the analysis Stage 2 Binary Logistic Regression, author specified case cohort study approach was used and the rare event cases as nursing home care, and random sample of the controls as the non nursing home cases. I think this description of study design and grouping probably should state earlier in the text.
III. Page 7, under Stage 1. Rasch analysis, line 8 & 9. “This was considered the most appropriate model … a short assessment tool,” reference (s) should be provided for this statement.
IV. (a) In the result section, in Stage 1, author described that “reducing the item set derived from the three scales gave a 17-item scale with a unidimensional construct of dependency …”, and then described the 17 items. However, how the 17-item scale was derived was not described and may cause confusion for readers.
   (b) For Results of binary logistic regression in table 3, only the model with all variables including LEADS cut off 19 was shown. An adding of the model with only LEADS cut off 19 in table 3 in comparison with the comprehensive model may make the “best model” more understandable.
   (c) For classification, is table 5 and 6, does LEADS algorithm mean overall variables plus LEADS cut off 19 or only the LEADS cut off? How did the score (240, 245, 250, 260) come up?
V. In the end of discussion, author stated that “these results need replicating on different populations….“ Please specify what is the population on that the results of this study can be generalized to.
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