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**Reviewer's report:**

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. On page 3 under methods. The first sentence should read "To develop this fall risk assessment we have chosen to combine scientific evidence and expert's opinions". The second sentence should have a "the" inserted before "literature".

2. On page 4 under results. The last sentence remove the "will".

3. On page 6 under step 1 change "was" for "were" in sentence number 5.

4. On page 7 2nd sentence change "seems" for "seemed" and take out "or not" at the end of the sentence.

5. On page 8 results. First sentence insert "the" before "literature" and add "people" after "elderly". Also in the second sentence add "people" after "elderly".

6. On page 11, sentence beginning "The more we know ..." needs rewording.

7. On page 20 change "BJM"to "BMJ" and change "Olivier" to "Oliver" in reference number 42.

8. In table 1 change "hart" to "heart" in heart rate factor.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

9. It may be better to call this tool a risk management tool rather than a risk assessment tool as the aim is to manage any risks identified rather than to assign a risk rating or score.

10. The methodology for developing this tool is weak. No testing or evaluation of the tool is mentioned. In its current form the tool represents expert opinion rather than strong scientific evidence. Cannot support the authors claim on page 13 that this tool can form a solid basis for developing fall guidelines for demented patients.
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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