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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have greatly improved the paper by clarifying the focus of the manuscript (from fall detection to creating specific fall risk interventions).

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
None

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
I would actually like to see another column added to Table 3 on the order of "Interventions" that would list some practical interventions that could be instituted based on the risk factor (most of which are common sense, e.g., "evaluate number and type of medications"). Or, if the authors so choose, such interventions could be spelled out in the body of the manuscript, e.g., create a "typical" case and discuss how the findings could be used to modify their fall risk. I think that the more pragmatic this clinical intervention paper becomes, the greater its value. In that vein, the methods section could be further shortened, but again this is not essential.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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