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Reviewer's report:

The study investigates whether two measurement tools of EQ5D+C and CAF could better capture quality of life among older people using two pilots studies from South Africa with 40 respondents and from the Netherlands with 30 respondents. Overall, the quality of the paper is OK. However, this paper has some defects as I listed below that need the authors to adequately address them.

1. What I concern most is the small sample size in these two pilot studies. Too small sample size could make the research outcomes less reliable as the results are likely biased. I would suggest the authors at least double their sample size to draw more robust conclusions.
2. The sample size for South Africa is inconsistent between Abstract (and the text in Methods) and tables.
3. It is more common to use "evaluate" or "evaluation" than to use "value" and "valuation" to make an assessment of something.
4. Abstract, Background (also Background in the body text): The aim of this research stated is not consistent with the title. Please revise the statement in Background of Abstract to better match the title. Furthermore, the sentence "to improve elderly quality of life and health state valuation (evaluation)" may consider deleting with direct objectives since these are not the purpose of this research.
5. Abstract: VAS and TTO should be spelt out. The meaning of VAS values should briefly introduced. Otherwise, it is difficult for readers to understand these values, such as 0.06 and 0.41.
6. No any appendices were provided, although the authors noted the TTO method (Appendix A) and VAS method (Appendix B). Only till I have these supporting materials can I make any further common on TTO and VAS.
7. Background, Line 72: "EQ5D+Cof" should be "EQ5D+C of". There should be a space between C and of.
8. There should have some brief introductions about EQ5+D, EQ5D+C, and ICECAP-O. May consider providing measurement items as Appendices. Although the authors mentioned the five domains of EQ5D+C, how man items included in EQ5D +C are unclear.
9. Discussion and Conclusions should be split (Please use Conclusions instead of conclusion and a Conclusions section should be placed after implications). The Discussion should be enhanced to focus on the major findings by linking with literature.
10. The paper can benefit for a professional editing and/or proofread.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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