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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential Revisions:

(1) Table 4 appears to be combined data from both facilities but this is not clear. If so table heading should make it clear.

(2) The assertion that gender is of borderline significance is not supported by the data (95% CI: 0.264 - 1.002) Language such as almost reached significance + stating measured confidence interval would be better.

(3) Similar comment for gender on the GRU

(4) Age was not significantly associated with repeat falling on the GRU (95% CI: 1.000 - 1.102). In this case it may be acceptable to describe this as "borderline significance"

(5) The abstract states that there is "some suggestion" that time of day of first fall may be associated with repeat falls. I am not sure whether the authors are claiming this as a significant result. If the authors are claiming this is a significant result they should use language such as "on the LSVU first falls in the morning or late evening were associated with repeat falling" and provide the data to support this.

(6) There are over 30 results listed in tables 4, 5, 6. It could be expected that one or two would be significant at 95% confidence level by chance. This may be the case here. I think the authors could acknowledge this in their study limitations or discussion.
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