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Reviewer's report:

Introduction. The introduction suggests that there are little to no studies that have examined the predictive ability of frailty scales. The author should ensure that the background appropriately synthesizes the evidence. One particularly high impact paper that they should consider referencing is:


Methods: FRéLE. The original French name should be stated here, rather than just the English translation.

Materials: aCGA. Please clarify what further frailty assessment was done if the subject scored positive on an aCGA domain; is this an expansion of the aCGA or one of the other measures? This is unclear.

Materials: Substantial evidence in the literature has demonstrated that frailty and disability are two separate constructs, yet the authors have define frailty as being 'moderately disabled or severely disabled'. I suggest to reconsider labelling this as frail or justify why it is appropriate to do so.

Statistical analysis: Please clarify as this sentence appears slightly contradictory "Individuals who became autonomous (28 subjects) in T2 were neglected and were included in the analyses". It is unclear if these 28 had 'mild disability' at T0 (28/527?) or were already excluded within moderate-severe disability.
Results: Consider removing the sentence on univariate analyses and focusing on the multivariate results as the sentence does not contribute to text. "Several variables were significantly associated with the occurrence of disability in univariate analyses (Table 3)."

Flow chart: Was there any loss to follow-up between T1 and T2. How were these subjects dealt with?

Figure 2. Consider removing this graph as the AUC values are sufficient

Table 3. This table should be reviewed as there are numbers missing in some cells. It is not clear what # indicates.

Discussion. There needs to be more discussion on gender in the discussion. Gender differences in frailty are widely accepted in the literature and are frequently included in base models (along with age). There is no mention of gender in the results until it appears in para 3 of discussion.

Writing/grammar: The authors should have a native English speaker read the manuscript for careful editing. Some of the text is disjoint/fragmented and there needs to be better flow between sentences. There are numerous typos, grammatical errors, and formatting errors that need to be corrected.

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

No

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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