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Reviewer's report:

General re-evaluation
More information and specification in the background, method and results obviously contribute to a better paper. The availability of the brochure on the site (cfr supplementary files) is also helpful to better understand the paper. The focus on content analysis explains the kind of results (the quantitative picture rather than a ‘thick’ description of the acceptance and comprehensibility of the brochure from the perspective of the seniors). The discussion however remains rather limited.

With some minor essential revisions, the paper could be published.

Design
The option for the methodology of symbolic interactionism is not clear and does not really appear in the analysis of the results. Why did the authors choose for this method and what does this mean for the analysis of data?

Setting and data collection
You write that, for warming up, participants were asked to talk about their own experience with falling or with fall risks. These talks could provide interesting information concerning the research group. One can imagine that the acceptance and comprehensibility of the brochure could be different according to their experience with falling. A good description of the sample is of crucial importance in qualitative research.

Results
Re: the overall acceptance: you conclude that in general, participants appreciated the EBPI brochure, based on 7/4 “very good” evaluations and 12/3 “good evaluations”. These are evaluations of 19 respondents. What do you know about the other 21 respondents?

Take care when you are reporting the results of a small minority (e.g. in Fall prevalence: “Participants judged the differentiation of fall, fall-related injury, and gender-related risk of hip fracture as far too detailed (2/2)). This is the opinion of only 2 respondents!

Re : Rating within groups of different educational levels. It would be more clear if you give all ratings, in stead of only the rates of 3 groups.

Discussion
Try to discuss more the findings instead of repeat the most important results. What do they mean (taking into account the methodology used)? What are the implications for you as research group, for others developing such kind of brochure? What specific further research do you suggest based on these results? ...