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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a nice job in responding and revising based on the initial feedback from the reviewers. As I read through the revised manuscript, I still feel that there is something missed by having only the clinic staff complete the survey, since they did not perform the frailty assessments. I would recommend that the research assistant complete the survey as well, but a) too much time may have passed at this point and b) it would only be the input of one person; still, a comment as to why the RA was not surveyed would be helpful.

It also would have been useful if the study had measured time to complete each of the assessments, so as to generate a mean time for assessment completion for the frailty phenotype and the SPPB. This would support your statement on page 15, lines 46-48 that "Therefore, selecting the frailty assessment protocol that requires the least amount of time to complete may be ideal for clinical settings." Given that you do not have objective time measures, I think you should consider adding a qualifier to the end of this sentence, such as "from a staff perspective."

Other revisions:


In the discussion section, page 16, line 15, I think it would be more informative to say "six out of nine participants" instead of "two thirds of participants classified as non-frail using Fried's phenotype method had cognitive impairment...".

In the discussion section, page 16, lines 31-33, inability to discern directionality is more related to the cross-sectional design of your study than the small sample size.

Table 1, for gender: it should be "Female, n (%)".

Thank you.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal