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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting well written paper outlining compliance with an unsuccessful falls prevention programme delivered in the Netherlands. The programme was based on a proven programme operating in the UK. It is most striking that there was a considerable delay in assessment and enactment of recommendations were low due to patients not consulting the GP and the GP not completing referrals.

Major compulsory revisions - none

minor essential revisions - It would be nice to know of for the few who did get the recommended referrals and treatments, whether there was any trend towards decreased falls? this is perhaps a question about a per protocol analysis from the main paper, but as the main paper is not accessible, i still ask.

It may be useful to contrast the health systems a little more. The UK has established and long operating geriatric clinics and may deliver a different assessment. Were the clinics set up for this study brand new? Is the range of rehabilitative services available the same in the two nations?

The paper has few issues of concern, is important and very informative.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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