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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript has much improved.

However, I have still some suggestions. The main problem is that the Discussion section is hard to read, and that abstract, results and conclusion do not really match:

- Please change the abstract. The conclusion is not logical: report the main results under Results in the abstract. Now you mention Fried’s scale in the Results section as the best instrument, and suddenly in the Conclusion section of the abstract you mention new results regarding the GFI, and don’t mention Fried anymore. I don’t understand the focus on the GFI and VES-13, as the OR results were rather similar for all instruments. That does not justify this conclusion in the abstract.

- Mortality data are delivered by the Québec institute of statistics. Are they based on death registries? Please clarify.

- Please explain what RAMQ is (provide English description / equivalent). I understand it, but most readers won’t understand.

- The authors write "After 2 years of follow-up, 419 subjects were excluded from the analysis (146 deceased and 273 lost to follow-up)". I don’t understand this, as mortality is the outcome measure. Then you should not exclude these people. Please clarify or correct this.

- Add number of event to Table 3 for all outcome measures.

- Table 3 is not fully described in the Results section of the manuscript. There are some interesting findings to mention, for example that the aCGA is not associated with institutionalization and mortality.

- In the Discussion, the authors write that the VES-13 seems to be the most 'appropriate' tool. Based on what? Please clarify and please change the wording (appropriate). Also, make the Abstract in line with this conclusion.

- The Discussion is difficult to read. It is not always clear what the authors mean, or what they base their conclusions on. For example, "This result demonstrates the little interest in using
Fried's scale to predict institutionalization in community-dwelling older adult", and "Additionally, we found a prevalence of 18.3% among elderly people aged 65 years and over who attended a periodic health examination (PHE) using the Gerontopole frailty screening tool (GFST)". These are statements that are not clear. Why suddenly talking about the GFST, an instrument that was not included in the current manuscript, but seems to used in another paper using the same dataset?

- The readability and English of the Discussion section should be improved.

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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