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Dear Dr Okura,

Thank you for your feedback on our manuscript entitled ‘The effect of interactive cognitive-motor training in reducing fall risk in older people: A systematic review’ (22219294564). We would also like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments that helped us to improve the manuscript. Changes in the manuscript have been made with the track changes option of Windows to allow easy detection. Please, find below our point-by-point responses.

I have an additional request. The first author of the manuscript (Daniel Schoene) would like to include this article as part of his PhD. The thesis submission date is the 29/8/2014. In case that you are satisfied with the responses we made with regard to the reviewers comments, could you send a confirmation that this article has been accepted for publication. We appreciate your collaboration!

Kind regards,

Eling de Bruin
Reviewer 1:

No comments

Reviewer 2:

Abstract line 33 state the dates the searches were made from

The sentence has been modified as suggested by the reviewer:

“Studies were identified with searches of the PubMed, EMBASE, and Cochrane CENTRAL databases from their inception up to 31 December 2013”.

Reviewer 3:

Regarding formatting comments for Tables 1-5:

We have now worked on the tables and standardized the format:

p-values have been consistently indicated with ‘p’;
the word months has been abbreviated with mo;
mean values and standard deviations are now in this format: mean (SD);
first letters of all cells are now capital letters;
the font type is Calibri throughout the tables;
‘from’ and ‘to’ have been changes to ‘pre’ and ‘post’;
title colors have been changed to black;
references and year of publication have been added behind each study’s author;
‘main findings’ has been changes to ‘mean results’ as suggested
the spelling error ‘visuo-satial’ has been corrected;
the foot note intervention/s is correct as it refers to the possibility of more than one intervention group and therefore more interventions

Regarding specific points in tables:

Some values are not written. (Studenski SPPB, Griffin TUG and FR)

In order to avoid overloading of the table we decided to include values as published for positive findings and just state the variable name for null- or negative findings (Studenski). Griffin et al. were published as letter to the editor and did not report all values.

In Schoene, “Unpublished:”; Is this not published?
Yes, this is right. This is a randomized controlled trial and only between group differences were published. But as this project was conducted by some of the co-authors we have the data and calculated the scores post-hoc for this review.

**Please add a column for the sum score.**

No sum score was calculated for the risk assessment. It is not recommended as it would imply that each item has the same weight in assessing potential methodological biases.

**Results:**

i), ii)....v) in page 10 and i), ii)....v) in pages 11-14: The titles of the five categories should be as consistent as possible. AND 

i), ii)...v): The titles of the main text and tables should be as consistent as possible.

To be consistent, we have added category names that match the subheading names as well as the names of the tables.

**Indicate the corresponding tables in each paragraph. For example, insert “(Table 1)” at the end of the first sentence.**

As suggested by the reviewer, we have added the Table number in brackets at the end of the first sentence in each of the five paragraphs.

**Discussion:**

Page 16, lines 329-332: Indicate the reference numbers.

We would prefer not to state the references here again as they are stated in the text body of the results section as well as indicated in the tables. Adding many references here does not add to the interpretation and discussion of the results.

**Figure 1:**

It seems controversial that “Abstract only (2)” was excluded after full text was obtained.

We understand the confusion which can be easily explained. Only after obtaining the full texts we could clarify that these two studies were only published as abstract.
Reviewer 4:

P9L159. “Tables 2-5 provide an overview of included studies.” The correct may be table 1-5. Please confirm the table numbers.

The reviewer is right. This mistake has been corrected.

Supp1 and 2 (Table 1-5 and 6). Because there are no reference numbers, it is hard to find a corresponding reference. Please insert the reference numbers in addition to current author names.

References have now been added to all tables and placed behind the Author and Year of publication.

Suppl2 (Table 6). There is no title in table 6; I suggest to insert a table title.

The following title has been added to table 6: “Table 6: Assessment of methodological quality of included studies using the Downs and Black scale (27)”

If paper capacity allow, I recommend to move table 1-5 into main body from current additional file because table 1-5 would be key results in this study.

The tables were uploaded as separate files but not in the intention to have them as supplementary material. Instead we believe they are important and should be part of the manuscript. BMC Geriatric is an online open access journal and we believe there is no limit for the numbers of tables.