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Reviewer’s report:

This is a nicely done work on exploring and consensus on domains important for old people, and the standard measurement set. I congratulate the authors’ great effort striking to achieving the first of its kind.

I have a few comments for further clarification.

1. More detail of the 6 focus groups need to be given. For example how many people was involved, gender distribution etc.

2. The opened questions asked in the focus groups should be stated.

3. The authors have presented the Domains from both literature search and focus group study in table 1 and 2. However, how the WG has come to the refined list of domains was not clearly explained. What was voted for during teleconf 4-6. Were the domains being voted, or the instruments for measuring the domains being voted?

4. The "decision result required a majority vote" would require a clearer definition.

5. It would be good to put in a supplementary table representing the essential voting on domains and instruments leading to this standard set.

6. What were the main domains that was endorsed, it is quite confusing to readers. In table 3, it seem that the green highlighted items were domains that was endorsed, please clarify.

7. How did these domain mapped to Porter’s 3 tiers. It would be desirable to present the tiers structure in table 3 for clarity.

8. About the instruments to measure the chosen domains. There is no information on the psychometric properties of instruments voted for to assess those domains. Were instruments being assessed on their psychometric soundness before endorsement? It was not mentioned in the manuscript. Even if instruments were not assessed in this manner, the rationale behind need to be explained.

9. Please explain in further detail what are "variables for case-mix adjustment". Although the concept was explained in previous publications, it remain a new concept to clinicians
in particular, and therefore clear and succinct explanation is needed for what they are and what they are used for.

10. Please clarify the position of fragility, which the WG agreed that is a risk factor variable rather than outcome. Does it mean it is a process to achieve good outcome rather than the outcome itself, and why may it be in table 3 which supposedly representing the "outcomes".

**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.

No

**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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