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Reviewer's report:

The methods and discussion sections are much clearer to understand than the last two versions of the manuscript.

MAJOR COMMENTS

1. A major issue that remains unaddressed is that the paper states that SPPB and Fried's Frailty Phenotype (FFP) are feasible tools to measure frailty. However, you excluded any patients in your study in which it would be difficult to assess physical frailty (did not speak English, unfit/unable to provide consent (presuming for low cognition) and those that did not wish to participate (eg the belief it would take too long). That is 71 out of 191 patients (37.2%). So that makes feasibility < 65%, not 90% which you have stated in your paper.

2. It is advised that when responding to reviewer comments, that you include the page and line number where you have made the change. This is a standard approach of addressing reviewer comments for all journals. Stating that "we have modified the paper" without referring to the page, paragraph or line number results is very confusing for reviewers. It is not clear why basic errors in responding to reviewer comments are evident in this paper.

3. In your background section, you state that the importance of considering frailty as a multidimensional concept involving many physical, psychological and social aspects (lines 41-43, page 4). However, your paper then ignores frailty as a multidimensional concept, and only looks at two physical phenotypes of frailty. In addition, you have devoted a whole paragraph in your background section on how important it is to measure frailty using a CGA, but then you don't include the CGA in your paper. Where is the discussion in your background sentence as to why we need to measure physical frailty? This information needs to be in the introduction section. Otherwise your background section in its current state effectively argues against why you need to do your study.

3. The majority of information on page 9 belongs in your introduction section, not your methods section (eg lines 20-31).
4. What are the implications for your study? This is not clear.

MINOR COMMENTS

1. This study is secondary study and this should be stated in your paper.

2. Your pie chart should not appear in your paper.

3. Tables should have horizontal lines only

4. In your introduction section, you state that frailty is a syndrome, then you have cited Clegg et al. (2013). However, Clegg and colleagues do not state that frailty is a syndrome; in fact they disagree that frailty is a syndrome - it is a state (or a condition). Therefore, it is suggested that you amend the word "syndrome" to appropriately reference their paper.
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