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Reviewer’s report:

This is a revised manuscript that reports validation of EMR-based frailty index (eFI) in a primary care practice in Canada. The authors adequately revised the manuscript in response to the previous comments. In particular, they clarified in the methods (page 2, eFI paragraph) that the eFI was calculated based on the manual review of all available information in their EMR, which was different from how the original eFI was calculated in the UK (i.e., from claims data). Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to remind that the rationale for the eFI development is to improve case identification for frail older adults without use of additional resources (this was stated in Clegg 2016 Age and Ageing paper). The current eFI calculation relies on labor-intensive review of medical records, which defeats the fundamental purpose of eFI calculation. This should be added to the limitations.

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.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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