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**Reviewer's report:**

OS and sarcopenia are fundamental elements to understand and manage the epidemiological transaction that the world is experiencing.

Investigating gender differences is an excellent way to better understand the mechanisms underlying the etiogenesis of this condition.

The article is based on well-argued data collection and the discussion is supported by a good analysis.

The non-modifiable critical points we found are:

The use of BIA is not the best system to investigate the composition in the elderly that also tends to be generally de-hydrated (Hydration health literacy in the elderly

Dominic Picetti, Stephen Foster, Amanda K. Pangle, Amy Schrader, Masil George, Jeanne Y. Wei, and Gohar Azhar * 2017)

The editable critical points we found are:

- The general data collection does not foresee any point related to the physical activity normally carried out by the patient who can in fact contribute, as an important variable, to the determination of fat mass and blood values.

- Add the graphical representation of table 3 to get a more immediate view of the conclusions.

- Expand the analysis in the discussion of the data regarding the causes that lead to the reduction of lean mass in humans more rapidly.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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