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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and important analysis in the context of falls prevention research. The conclusion that non adherence with recommendations is a major factor in non effectiveness appears justified.

The reviewer agrees that the long period between baseline assessment and sending letters to GPs is likely to have influenced adherence with recommendations.

The recommendations made in the Discussion section are well justified in the reviewer’s opinion.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The reviewer is surprised that there were not more medical recommendations. Could the authors comment further on this? Specifically why were there not more recommendations for physiotherapy for strength and balance training, osteoporosis assessment and treatment (Vitamin D and calcium, as well as bisphosphonates), medication alteration (particularly psychotropic medications), vision assessment / treatment, recognition and treatment of depression, and management of undernutrition? The rate of detection of these issues seems to be lower than in the PROFET study. Does this mean that the participants were already receiving appropriate treatment in these areas? Are the inclusion criteria definitely the same between the PROFET and current studies?

2. In exploring the limited adherence to recommendations, it would assist the reader if adherence could be expressed as a percentage overall and as percentages for each type of recommendation. Is it possible to comment on a comparison of the rate of adherence with recommendations from this and the PROFET study?

The rate of adherence with occupational therapy interventions is stated as 59% and, from Figure 2, the adherence with medical recommendations appears to be 25 / 69 = 36%.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. A factor that should receive some attention is the treatment, and quality of care, provided to the control group in both the PROFET and the current studies. While this is not the focus of the current paper there should be a comment about
this.
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