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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for submitting this manuscript for review. I have conducted a thorough review and provide my comments for each of the sections below.

Background

I appreciate that what the authors are explaining is conceptually complex; however, the background section is too long and could be structured better. As a result the rationale and importance of the work is lost. Also, I believe the background section would benefit from adopting a more critical gerontology perspective. The literature requires updating. For instance, the authors claim that 'successful ageing' has only recently been reconceptualised. However, this concept has been criticised for many years and even superseded by notions of active ageing and healthy ageing - the authors cite papers that are over 10 years old.

There is an over-reliance on the use of figures in the background section; could this not be described succinctly instead?

For an international audience, 'older adults' or 'older people' are more accepted terms than elder or elders.

Ln 74 Please explain what you mean by 'stages of ageing' (life stages would be more appropriate since age stages is a more contested term)

Ln 75 Is it not a case of finding the right program for the right older adults? Sorry to be pedantic.

Ln 96 Paragraph starting on Ln96 requires editing - the excessive use of e.g. interrupts the flow.

Ln116 Can you provide evidence to support this statement re: frailty?

The authors described adaptive capability but do not describe resilience, which is an important concept in this work.
Methods

The methods seem well-described and concise

Findings

The findings seem to be reported in full - however, please note that I am not a statistician so cannot comment on the accuracy of the statistics

Discussion

The background section is in need of amending. The authors only lightly discuss their findings in the context of existing research - the discussion could be therefore be strengthened by the inclusion of more literature.

Ln 429 the term 'health architecture' is unusual.

Additional comments

Were older people involved in the design of this project (e.g. patient and public involvement)?

**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.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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