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Reviewer’s report:

It is an improved version of manuscript. It is now clear that there is only one single focus group that was carried out.

- In this case, please mention all focus group information in the manuscript as singular. It would be desirable to state who were the participants, were they older people, or their care giver? What may be the gender distribution?

- It worth to mention that It was not surprised that some domains did not emerged in the single focus group as the sample size was tiny, and saturation of ideas have not been reached. But the information for the working group members were coming from the combination of literature review and the single focus group.

- It looks as if the Delphi exercises (3 rounds) were all on "Outcome domains", rather than "outcome measures", if it is the case, please emphasize in table titles that they are "outcome domains".

- I can agree with the authors and think they should emphasize to say the "instruments" chosen to measure those "domains" were "preliminary". They were chosen based on practical reasons, like comprehensiveness, feasible, free of license fee etc, rather than based on the measurement properties, and scientific merits of the "instrument per se".

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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