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Reviewer's report: They have adequately discussed by suggestions.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

The language corrections were done, including corrections suggested by the first reviewer. The paper was revised, including the tables.

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.

Reviewer: Amanda Salis

Reviewer's report: This manuscript is much improved from the original version I reviewed. A few queries arose in the current review of this manuscript. These are minor essential revisions, in my view.

1. The manuscript will benefit from revision of English expression. For example, paragraphs should not start with statements such as “In addition, ...”. Also, the word ‘Though’ on line 99 should be ‘Although’, and “painful processes” would be more appropriate as “painful conditions”.

The corrections were done. The paper was revised, including the tables.

2. The definition of “(3MW = R$2.034/$750)” is still unclear. What exactly does this mean? Isn’t 3MW just 3 times the minimum monthly wage? If yes, this should be stated explicitly. Do you mean to say that this number, 3 x MW, is 2.035 Brazilian Real, which is equivalent to US$750?

Yes, 3MW is 2.034 Brazilian Real, which is equivalent to US$750. We change in the paper as suggested: “In our study, family income was dichotomized as less than 3 MW and 3 MW or more (3MW is R$2.034 Brazilian Real, which is equivalent to US$750 dollars)”.

3. On lines 419 – 423, can ‘small’ be defined in objective terms? How do these ‘small’ changes reported in the literature compare to the ‘small’ changes reported in the current study?

Regarding the lines 419-423, “It has been found that among those assessed at 53 years, those not assessed 10 years later because they had died in the intervening period, or were unable to do the tests for health reasons at 60–64 years, had significantly lower performance scores at 53 years than those measured at both ages (among whom a decline in mean levels of performance for chair rise speed was observed)” [1] and chair stand test is also predictive of disability [2]. Unfortunately, these papers used different methods to calculate performance with the chair stand test and thus we cannot directly compare their results with ours. We
hypothesize that the women with worse physical performance in chair stands (the sarcopenic obese) will present, at older ages, more adverse health outcomes than the others, however we will be able to test this hypothesis only with the longitudinal analyses (forth coming). Therefore, to be clearer, we adapted the phrase in the text.
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