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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed most of my comments, and the manuscript has much improved. The mortality data is a very interesting addition. However, there are a few points that still need attention:

- The sample for the mortality analyses is larger (n=1643) than the other analyses. That should be mentioned in the Abstract. Please revise the abstract, with a sentence like "In total, 1643 participants were included in the mortality analyses and 1224 participants in the analyses of the other outcomes (74.5% of the original sample)."

- On Page 6 this sentence says: "Thus, the event of interest was the occurrence of moderate disability or severe disability at T1 or T2 in subjects who were fully independent or mildly disabled at T0." However, in the response to reviewer comments the authors say that they used only T2 outcomes. Please clarify this, and revise accordingly.

- In the previous review I asked for details on the measurement instruments for frailty. The authors write in the reply to the reviewer comments that this information was added. However, I do not see this information in the manuscript. So, my questions remain: how were Fried’s frailty criteria measured? How and who did the GFI translation from English/Dutch? Is the translation validated?

- I have the impression the Methods section is not complete. The new outcome measures (institutionalization and mortality) are not described. How were they measured? How was mortality assessed (municipality registries? Medical records?).

- Table 3: why are some effects printed in bold? Not all statistically significant effects are in bold.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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