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**Reviewer's report:**

Dear authors,

You developed a relevant scoping systematic review protocol (SYSR-D-17-00285 "Methods for quantifying physical resilience in aging: A scoping systematic review protocol."). The planned review aims to identify and to analyze "outcome domains" and "measurement instruments" for physical resilience. A synthesis and mapping of key concepts as well as a description of the state of the art is planned.

**Title:**

Considering your whole manuscript, should the title of the review protocol not be adapted? You are predominately looking for "outcome domains" and "measurement instruments". Can it be summarized as "methods"?

**Abstract:**

No remarks.

**Keywords:**

Please check if "senior" is a suitable keyword. Check also for suitable Mesh-Terms.

**Introduction:**

- Page 3, line 17: This sentence is unclear. Which development is meant?

- Page 5, line 21: Please concretize and differentiate the concept "coping" in the context of "resilience".
- Please introduce shortly Boers et al. (2014) in the introduction section. What is the role of Boers et al. (2014) in your review?

Methods:

Study design

- Please motivate the choice for the review design? Why is a systematic scoping more suitable than a systematic review to answer the research question?

Search methods for study identification

- Page 7, line 13/14: Please describe the Mesh-Terms and keywords separately.

- Is it correct that all databases will be searched via Ovid? Please describe it earlier on page 7, line 9/10. If not, please describe why the same search strategy will be applied to all databases?

Do you consider that there are specific Mesh-terms per database?

- Where are the search terms derived from?

Selection of studies

- Your explanation as to why you had to include "aged animals" is unclear.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

- The outcomes are also described in the data extraction section. In my opinion it fits better in the data extraction section. Also, describe Boers et al. (2014) in more detail.

Data extraction

- Page 10, line 7-9: Describe precisely how you will verify the validity of the outcomes? Please, concretize "minimal clinically important difference (MCID)".

- You could subdivide the data that will be extracted for a first literature overview and the data that will be extracted for quantitative and qualitative analysis and data description. In that section you can differentiate between primary and secondary outcomes.
Please concretize in more detail the "measurement instruments" and its extraction. What is your focus? Are you interested, e.g., in the validation of the instruments?

Data synthesis and gap identification

- Please concretize the data synthesis. Suggested literature is:


- Please concretize the gap identification, "methodological gaps".

Discussion:

- Please check the choice of wording. Is the review focused on "methodology" in general? Page 11, line 18/19: "This scoping systematic review will be the first to summarize methodology for quantifying physical resilience in aging."

General remarks:

- Please be consistent in your wording. Are you looking for "methods", "methodology", "outcomes", "outcome domains", "measures" and/or "measurement instruments"?
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