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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very interesting paper which successfully uncovers the whole picture of evidence on the effects of ICMT on risk of falls. Since the current paper contains large amount of descriptive information, and in order to improve the legibility of readers, the expressions need to be as consistent as possible throughout the paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None.

Minor Essential Revisions
Tables 1 to 5:
1. The following expressions should be fixed in a consistent manner.
   1.1. “P<.05” or “p<.05”
   1.2. “months” or “mo”
   1.3. mean (SD) or mean ± SD
   1.4. The first letter of the description should all be in capital. (titles, sample characteristics, and main findings)
   1.5. The forms of characters were mixed. (Arial? and Times New Romans?)
   1.6. “pre post” or “from to”
   1.7. Some values are not written. (Studenski SPPB, Griffin TUG and FR)
   1.8. The color of the titles: blue or black.
2. Study, sample: It is preferred to put reference number on the names of the authors, and add published year.
3. Main findings: This is more like “main results”.
4. In Schoene, “Unpublished:”: Is this not published?
5. In Maillot, “visuo-satial”: visuo-spatial?

Risk assessment items:
6. Footnote: “intervention/s”. Is this correct?
7. Please add a column for the sum score.
8. First author, year: Indicate the reference number.
Results
9. 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.

10. Page 10, line 198: How did you define low or high challenge of balance?

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

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

Discussion

Discretionary Revisions

Figure 1:
14. It seems controversial that “Abstract only (2)” was excluded after full text was obtained.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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