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Reviewer’s report:

This paper examines the properties of a new composite risk assessment tool for older adults' biopsychosocial needs. The paper has the potential to make a useful contribution to the geriatric assessment arena. The paper has many strengths, including a well described, thorough analysis on a large sample, and tables and figures that substantiate the content. I do have a few questions and suggestions to improve the paper, however:

1) Both the abstract and the Introduction are difficult to follow, referring to many concepts (e.g. Third Agers and Fourth Agers, the Proactivity Model) and abbreviations (BPS resources, H-R QoL) without much, if any, explanation. There is also an overuse of abbreviations (e.g. CD courses, CM) which makes some simple concepts overly complex. The Introduction is also organized in such a way so that exactly what the authors are focusing on, and why this is important, is not entirely clear until the end. I would suggest explaining all concepts as clearly as possible upon their first mention, and reorganizing the entire introduction so that the flow of ideas is clearer.

2) While the Loads-Lever-Lifts Processes and the goal of Adaptive Capability are both explained well and connected to the screener, both the linearity of this approach and the derivation of the "some" vs. "a lot" benchmarks seems a little oversimplistic, and their validity could be better explained.

3) While the authors do an excellent job explaining how their screener differs from QoL and bio-functional scales, and the potential implications of the screener's use, they do not clearly explain how the screener differs from other measures that also capture biopsychosocial factors, such as the SF-36?

4) The Psychological domain seems very limited compared to the Biological domain, and does not capture key psychological symptoms, such as anxiety or irritability. While I know that these items came from the EASYCare standard, the authors could have added items, and could better explain the rationale for the relatively brevity of this section.

5) In the Discussion, the authors make number of statements about the relative contributions of biological, psychological, and social factors to the health outcomes analyzed. It should be more clearly noted that these conclusions are only applicable in this particular sample,
not to all older adults. And an added limitation is that the study was conducted with a convenience sample in a single neighborhood in Singapore, and cannot be generalized.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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