Reviewer’s report

Title: Standard Set of Health Outcome Measures for Older People

Version: 0 Date: 14 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Marilyn Rantz

Reviewer’s report:

Important work and very relevant internationally, thank you for undertaking this work, some comments to improve relevance/clarity for readers:

1) ICHOM needs explanation (brief in abstract, more detail in the background) for the reader who is likely NOT to be familiar with your organization, its purpose and time since inception, the reader needs to understand who the organization is and how reputable it is, this is not a common organization across disciplines or countries.

2) in Methods, the reader needs clarification that focus groups were selected only in the UK and some description of the older adults current living conditions, ethnicity, socio-economic status, etc., and and explanation of the organization of "Age UK" that most readers will not be familiar with, as with the ICHOM, explanation and web site will be helpful to the reader to evaluate the sampling of for the focus groups, and how many people on average were in each of the 6 focus groups?

3) in Table 2, the 3rd bullet on the right column, there may be a typo, "or care" at the end of the bullet is likely "of care"

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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