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Reviewer's report:

I'm not sure about this.

There is, I think, limited news value here in terms of the correlation between the scores. More work showing that assorted Frailty scales align with each other to a greater or lesser extent probably doesn't move the scientific discourse forward a great deal. The relative sensitivity and specificity of the two measures would have been more interesting as it would have enabled selection of a preferred tool, but the authors stop someway short of this, because they haven't provided a gold-standard comparator to enable such comparisons.

Given that this is meant to be a study of feasibility of the two measures, I was disappointed not to see some qualitative data about the relative acceptability and ease-of-completion for each of the two tools. These are the sort of the data required to make choices about these tools in the real world. Simply looking at completion rates in both tools is not helpful (the fact it was so high for both indices probably just means that this was a particularly concordant sample). The comments about the relative difficulty of specific aspects of different tests (hand grip dynamometry is difficult in people with hand-joint disease, whilst gait times and sit-to-stand tests are difficult in people with gait disorders) seem less like research outputs and more like observations that could have been gleaned from a quick read through both tools.

Overall, I am quite underwhelmed. All this study really tells me is that both tools can be completed by a small and highly concordant community-based population in a single care setting, in the rarified context of a research study, without any attention to the implementation factors that would effect the real-world implementation of these tools.
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