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Reviewer's report:

This is an original, well designed and well conducted study. There some points which need clarification to improving the reporting of the study.

1. The strongest relationship reported is between perception of ageing and QOL. But the authors haven't considered or if considered haven't reported a potential bias: the first statement in CASP-19, their measure of QOL is also statement about perception of ageing ("My age prevents..."). Ideally, a sensitivity analysis between perception of ageing and a CASP scale where the first item is dropped should be done.

2. An important aspect of this paper is the integration of BPS with quality of life. However that integration has nit been elaborated in the text or in Figure 1.

3. In the file I reviewed, there were two Figure 2s, with differences and two Figure 3s which seemed identical. Relabel or remove them.

4. It was mentioned that the focus group was done in English. Was the questionnaire also in English? Quality of life is a culturally sensitive, therefore, authors should discuss the impact of measuring it in English (if that was done).

5. The reporting of focus group was very parsimonious. Some kind of tabular or other visualisation of emergent themes will be helpful.

6. Normalisation Process Theory was mentioned but how its constructs relate to the study was not elaborated, which needs to be done.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? 
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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