Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the comments of editor and reviewers concerning our manuscript entitled “Correlation between the Charlson comorbidity index and sarcopenia in hospitalized older people” (BGTC-D-19-00560R1). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We revised the paper according to the comments of editor and reviewers. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the comments are as follows:

Editor:
1. Please clarify whether this study was prospective or retrospective according to the following definitions:
   - Prospective: participants were enrolled before data collection
   - Retrospective: data was analyzed from medical records; data collection was done as part of routine care

   Response to the comment: This study was retrospective.

2. If the study was prospective, please clarify when participants provided informed consent. If the study was retrospective, please clarify how you got permission to access the medical records.

   Response to the comment: This study was retrospective. We visited the hospital electronic medical record system and this study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Jinling Hospital. We have added to the methods section with blue font.

3. Please change the heading "Additional files" to "Figure Legends", remove the "S" in each figure title, and remove the table descriptions.

   Response to the comment: We have revised it according to the editor comments at the end of the paper.
Reviewer:

1. Authors explained the sampling process was according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria and 168 eligible patients were finally screened out as Fig. 1. However, authors should calculate this sample size met the statistical power.

   Response to the comment: We have calculated the statistical power and added it to the Statistical analysis of method section (Meanwhile, PASS 15.0 software was used to calculate the statistical power.) and the Participant Characteristics of result section (And the results showed a sample size of 168 with $\alpha = 0.05$ (both sides) for 100% power.) with blue font.

2. On page 5, authors used Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia (AWGS) reliable test for sarcopenia [17], physical function is generally evaluated on the basis of the individual's gait speed and the established cut-off value for normal gait speed. However, sarcopenia is considered when low muscle strength, low muscle quantity/quality and low physical performance are all detected. Although authors had put lack of skeletal muscle strength data as one of limitations, I think this study was not for sarcopenia.

   Response to the comment 2 and 3: In this study, we measured the SMI and gait speed mainly for skeletal muscle mass and physical performance, due to lack of skeletal muscle strength data, so we have amended the topic and content with blue font.

   All modifications are shown in blue font.

   Finally, we would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for comments on our paper.