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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewing the manuscript entitled, "Prognostic value of frailty in elderly patients with acute coronary syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis." by Dou QD. et al., overall, this is a clear, concise, and well-written manuscript about relevance between frailty in geriatric patients and ACS. Therefore, this manuscript will be acceptable after response to my concerns.

Concerns

#1. Line 129 to 131 in the Results, the authors mentioned "Of those, 9 were excluded after more detailed inspection of full texts. We finally identified 15 publications, including 8554 patients.". However, the authors need to show how to exclude 9 publications. What is detailed inspection? This is very important procedure. You excluded 9 publications despite after critique. Please explain how you exclude 9 publications.

#2. Table 1 displays the selected 15 publications. All clinical studies were performed after 2011. I think that you finally selected comparatively-new clinical studies. Is there any comment about this in the discussion? Because around 2005, the drug eluting stent, which is one of PCI therapy, showed up in the clinical area, and then PCI therapy was drastically progressive. Dual Antiplatelet Therapy (DAPT) that is the representative 2nd prevention of PCI was published in 1998.

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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