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Reviewer’s report:

In this single-centre, observational study, the authors surveyed health care professionals (HCP) caring for patients enrolled in the Elder-friendly Approaches to the Surgical Environment (EASE) study in an effort to assess perceptions and attitudes towards perioperative frailty assessment. Responses to an author-developed survey were obtained from 49 of 117 (42%) HCP from three main subgroups: nurses, surgeons, and other allied health professionals. The authors report significant intergroup differences in responses. Lack of knowledge about frailty issues was a prominent barrier to the use of frailty assessment in practice across all subgroups of HCPs.

For the most part, the manuscript is well-written. I do have a couple of comments about the survey development and analysis:

1) During survey development, there appears to be an attempt to ascertain content validity. How did the authors assess reliability? This should be described in the methodology section.

2) It would be interesting to see all of the final 26 survey items included. These are supposed to be present in Figure 1 (page 5) but I am unable to see a Figure 1 with the submission.

3) Mean response scores as a function of HCP subgroup to a subset of survey items are presented in Table 2. The authors further describe results of t-tests reflecting pairwise comparisons of two of the three subgroups (i.e. page 6 - nurses vs. surgeons, allied health vs. surgeons). Was there an attempt to control for multiple comparisons during the analysis (eg. ANOVA, followed by post-hoc tests?) If so, the details of this should be described in the analysis section.

4) Interpretation of Table 2 is confusing. For instance, 16 nurses were surveyed but it appears that only 9/13 answered the 1st item? How should the '9' and '13' be interpreted? Some explanatory table footnotes would be helpful.

5) The authors report selected Spearman's rank-order correlations between various survey items. Was there ever consideration given to examining these correlations as a function of HCP subgroup which can be accomplished with a linear regression framework?

6) On page 7, the authors state 'Four survey questions captured interdisciplinary HCPs perceptions of the usefulness of frailty assessment scores in clinical practices (Table 3)’. I only see 3 questions with their mean responses in Table 3. Should the fourth be one relating to awareness of the CSF?
7) On page 6, what do the authors mean by 'we conducted tests of independence in the pooled surgeon subgroup'?
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