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**Reviewer’s report:**

This is a well described study. A previous protocol of this study is available and sets this piece of work as part of a larger body of work.

The feasibility criteria are pre-specified with relevant and achievable markers of success.

The authors identify several features of the study (like recruitment) that did not work out as planned. This highlights the need for studies such as this before embarking on a larger trial.

With only a 27% eligibility rate for people returning information from the mail out, I wonder if this recruitment target group needs further consideration. It seems a lot of work (from 1227 respondents to get 51 people). Would the authors like to comment on this? If the goal is to recruit for a larger trial, what pool people may be required?

I have some reservations about the use of the SPPB as a measure of future disability, however the authors provide good evidence to support its predictive value.

I do query that 0.03m/s is a meaningful clinically important difference is gait speed. Please provide some evidence to justify this.

Publication of studies such as this help other researchers in planning their pre-specified data collection and demonstrate the value of feasibility trials.
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