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Author’s response to reviews:

We appreciate the comments from editor and revised our manuscript according to them.

1. In your “ethical approval and consent to participate” section please confirm whether written consent was obtained from participants. If written consent was not obtained, please explain why not.

We have added the confirmation of consent in the "ethical approval and consent to participate” section as “We obtained written consent from community-dwelling elderly with disability and used the opt-out consent strategy for the independent community dwellers.” (Ethical approval and consent to participate section, line 295, page 17).

Thank you for the opportunity to confirm that we have obtained consent from our participants. We obtained written consent from community-dwelling elderly with disability. As for the independent community dwellers, all measurements were carried out as a part of the physical examination in their medical check-up services. For utilizing their records, we used the opt-out consent strategy. The opt-out consent strategy fulfills the ethical imperative of informed consent and implies rights of individuals to refuse inclusion[1]. These consent strategy was given approval by our institutional ethics committees of Kameda Medical Center.

2. In the Funding section, please also describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
The funding bodies had no involvement in this study and did not any influence the study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, nor writing of this paper. (Funding section, line 310, page 18).

3. We would also like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of KN and ST as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to the listed tasks alone, does not usually justify authorship.

We added the sentence of "KY, SM, ST, KN and TO conceived and designed the study." (Authors’ contributions section, line 313, page 18).

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify the authorship of our manuscript. KN and ST were critical to this study as they were involved in the initial process of conceiving and designing the study. Therefore, we have added them to the first sentence as "KY, SM, ST, KN and TO conceived and designed the study." Their significant contribution is highly appreciated, from conceptualizing this study to delivering the revised manuscript. They indeed qualify for authorship. If there are further concerns about authorship please let me know so I can address this issue.

In addition to the response to the editor's comments, we added unstandardized coefficient in Table 3d, since 95% CI in this table was for the unstandardized coefficient although we only showed the standardized coefficient.
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