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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:

This paper attempts to investigate the determine the reliability of protocol used to measure postural balance using a force or a balance plate within a group of fallers and non-fallers. This study employed a single and dual-task (with and without vision) based simple methodology. The results show a good reliability and no specific systematic errors in the protocol to measure postural balance.

While the methodology is simple and straightforward, the reported investigation concentrates on the protocol. Given that there are several technologies available for CoP and balance measurements (for example: force platform, pressure platform other balance boards) a discussion on this topic will add value to the paper.

Specific Comments:

Background: Given the comments, consider including a succinct paragraph on technologies available for "posturography" or posture assessment.

Methodology: Consider providing a couple of sentences on the interview; the approach and type of questions.

Did you use all 20 seconds data (for CoP) or did you take the middle 10 seconds as in many other studies? This needs to be mentioned.

Discussion: You include a statement on predictive values of CoP. If you would like to include this in the discussion, you should provide a critical analysis of the area and link your results to this concept. In my opinion, this paper doesn't look at this and this reference could be removed.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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